

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for the *London Quarterly Review* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_london-quarterly-and-holborn-review_01.php

The London Quarterly and Holborn Review

Editors { Rev. JOHN TELFORD, B.A.
 { Rev. B. AQUILA BARBER

APRIL, 1932

PREACHING	J. Arundel Chapman, M.A. B.D.
THE RUSSIAN PROBLEM	Joseph Ritson
SOCRATES AND JESUS: THEIR TRIALS AND DEATHS	Dr. G. M. Wainchoppe, L.R.C.P.
TENNYSON AND FAITH	Leslie S. Peake M.A., B.Litt.
CHRIST'S MIRACLES AND THEIR MESSAGE	A. Lewis Humphries, M.A.
JOSEPHUS AND GOSPEL HISTORY	R. Martin Pope, M.A., B.D.
ARCHBISHOP TEMPLE'S CHARGE	Frank Richards, M.A.
MEASURE FOR MEASURE	A. Marmorstein, Ph.D.
WITNESS TO THE TRUTH	Arthur Boutwood
CHRISTOLOGY: ITS STARTING-POINT AND PLACE IN CHRISTIAN THINKING	C. J. Wright, B.D., Ph.D.
NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS—	
DR. ADOLF HARNACK ON 'THE INNER LIFE'	J. G. Tasker, D.D.
MINISTERS' STUDY CIRCLE	W. E. Farndale
FOUR NEW BOOKS ON THE BIBLE	W. L. Wardle, M.A., D.D.
RECENT LITERATURE: Theology and Apologetics; History, Biography, and Travel; General	
PERIODICAL LITERATURE: British, American, Canadian, Foreign	

London:

EPWORTH PRESS, J. Alfred Sharp,
25-26 City Road, E.C.1.

HOLBORN PUBLISHING HOUSE, Ernest Barrett,
Holborn Hall, Clerkenwell Road, E.C.1.

PRICE 2s. 6d. NET. ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION 10s. POST FREE

THE LONDON QUARTERLY AND HOLBORN REVIEW

APRIL, 1982

PREACHING

[The following is a paper which has been read to one or two groups of preachers. The suggestion was made that it should be published. This is now done. It was felt to be better to publish it in the form in which it was read, with the personal touches unaltered. The writer wishes to acknowledge his deep debt to his father, Dr. James Chapman, for many of the thoughts which he derived from him, either in the way of conversation on preaching or from notes which he left behind him.]

IT is only after considerable misgiving that I have chosen 'Preaching' as my subject. 'After misgiving,' I say, because it may so easily be thought that one who speaks about preaching arrogates to himself some special ability in it. But I comfort myself with the thought that one can speak or write about poetry without thereby claiming to be an outstanding poet. I give you the assurance which I hope is unnecessary that I approach the subject as one among many of my brethren, as one who has learnt just enough to show him how much more he has still to learn.

But there is some special influence which has impelled—almost constrained—me to choose this subject. During the last two years I have been deeply stirred by the theology of Karl Barth, and he has driven me back on the Word of God contained in the Bible, which the preacher has to proclaim. I need not remind you that the origin of his theology was in preaching. Do you know of any other recent theology which has originated in this way? Let me read to you his words. 'For twelve years I was a minister as all of you are. I *had* my theology. It was not really mine, to be sure, but that of my unforgotten teacher, Wilhelm Herrman, grafted upon the principles which I had learned, less consciously than unconsciously, in my native home. . . .

Once in the ministry, I found myself growing away from these theological habits of thought and being forced back, at every point, more and more upon the specific *minister's* problem, the sermon. I sought to find my way between the problem of human life, on the one hand, and the content of the Bible, on the other. As a minister, I wanted to speak to the people in the infinite contradiction of their life, but to speak the no less infinite message of the Bible, which was as much of a riddle as life. Often enough these two magnitudes, life and the Bible, have risen before me—and still rise—like Scylla and Charybdis; if *these* are the whence and whither of Christian preaching, who shall, who can, be a minister and preach?'' So his travail as a preacher became, as he says, a marginal note to all theology, and the child of this travail was the Epistle to the Romans. No one who has absorbed the spirit of Barth can ever undervalue preaching.

Now that, I fear, is one of our temptations. Preaching can easily be crowded out—at least the careful preparation for it can—by other elements in our work, by visiting, by a round of meetings, through all that we mean by that terrible phrase, 'running our Churches.' There is also a tendency to let other elements in public worship overshadow it. As long as this is prayer, it is all to the good. The mischief begins when it is the music—at any rate, some music—and it becomes deadly when it is the collection. I always feel that, in certain parts of England, I want to refuse all invitations to Sunday-school anniversaries. Thirdly, there is the fact that those to whom we preach are critical of sermons, and in many cases want them as short and shallow and exciting as possible. I remember a good man in Huddersfield telling me that he did not come to hear me preach because I did not warm him up. It is important

¹ *The Word of God and the Word of Man*, English trans. p. 100. I wish to acknowledge my indebtedness to Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton for permission to quote this passage.

that we should guard against being influenced by such opinions as these. It is very easy for us all to get a kind of corporate inferiority-complex with regard to preaching, and to adopt almost an apologetic tone when we speak of it. A preacher who depreciates preaching, or who imagines that he can atone for inefficiency in it by diligence in other spheres is lost. Our call is a call to preach.

What a succession we are in! Behind us is the rugged Amos, going to Bethel with his God-given message—

The lion hath roared, who will not fear?
The Lord God hath spoken, who can but prophesy?

the deep and tender Jeremiah, labouring with his vocation, groaning over the sins he has to denounce, declaring the gracious purposes of God—

And if I say, I will not make mention of Him,
Nor speak any more in His name,
Then there is in my heart as it were a burning fire
Shut up in my bones,
And I am weary with forbearing,
And I cannot contain [myself].

There is Paul hastening restlessly through the cities of Asia Minor and Europe with the message of the Cross, saying, 'Woe is me, if I preach not the gospel.' There are the Dominican and Franciscan preachers who awakened Italy in the thirteenth century, Luther rousing Germany with his trumpet notes, Wesley and his heroic band recalling England to the ways which are in Christ, Spurgeon seeking to evangelize a great city. And at the centre of all these is the figure of Him who is portrayed in the Gospels—the consummation of one order of preachers, and the beginning of another—saying, 'As the Father hath sent Me, even so send I you.' And you and I have our place in this company. You remember how, in the first circle of the Inferno, Dante met the great men and women of Greece and Rome, and says that by the sight of them he

was exalted in his own esteem. To be even a humble member of that band of which I have spoken must exalt us in our own esteem. We are in a great succession.

There are many lines I should like to follow. I might speak of the Word of God, as revealed in the Bible, to which, with prophetic earnestness, Karl Barth is recalling us. I might speak of the message of the Cross, what Paul calls 'The Word of the Cross,' to return to which in all its searching, revealing depths is so imperative. I might speak of the work of the Spirit, by whom alone the message can be burnt into the human heart, or I might approach the subject from another standpoint, and speak of the qualifications of the preacher. He must be a saint, a philosopher, a poet, and an actor, and in these days, some would add a humorist. He must be a saint, for he needs an experience and a life, vision and character : a philosopher, for he must think out his message : a poet, for he must clothe it in the rich colours of the imagination, and an actor, for he must deliver it with gesture, force, and fire.

But I wish to follow a different line, though it will lead to and include some of the thoughts which I have already brought before you. The noblest of all forms of literature, poetry, at its highest approaches very near to preaching. Matthew Arnold defined poetry as a criticism of life. If we read enough into the word 'criticism,' it is a striking definition. And the same elements of life which pass before the poet's eye come before the preacher. He has to apply to them the test of definite and eternal principles. Is not the new theology of Barth, Brunner, and Gogarten called 'The Theology of Crisis' ? And crisis means, among other things, testing, judgement. The preacher has to judge, to stamp some elements as false and base, and others as true and pure. It is a great responsibility. Can you conceive a higher vocation than that of weighing the elements of life in the balances of God ?

And it is nothing less than the whole of life in its entirety

that we have to judge. There is nothing that lies outside the preacher's sphere. We see that if we look at the Old Testament prophets. How their quick eye took in everything that was before them, and weighed everything in the scales of God ! We have to test all things by the standards of God. And to do that we must first of all see God in the whole of life, in the forms of nature, in the events of history, in political developments, social crises, industrial movements, and, not least in common life. Especially is this necessary in this age when we may be witnessing the beginning of another unfolding of the plan of God, God plucking His hand out of His bosom to work more mightily.

And here, if I may interject this, we see the importance of studying the Bible. The Bible is full of God. It refreshes and revives our sense of God. With the Bible and its message in our hearts and minds, we shall see God working, and judge things as God judges them.

Some of the great poets of the world have aspired to be preachers. In the *Prelude* there is often a suggestion of this, and an even greater than Wordsworth, John Milton, shows in one passage how he thought of himself as a preacher. In a striking passage in his prose works¹ he writes : ' These abilities are the inspired gift of God, and are of power, beside the office of a pulpit, to imbreed and cherish in a great people the seeds of virtue, teaching over the whole book of sanctity and virtue with such delight that, whereas the paths of honesty and good life appear now rugged and difficult, though they be indeed easy and pleasant, they will appear to all men both easy and pleasant, though they were rugged and difficult indeed.' Is not this account of the poet's work a noble account of the calling of the preacher ? We have to make the paths of goodness easy and pleasant, though they are rough and difficult. If we realize the high vocation of the preacher who has to scan human life and judge

¹ Milton, *Prose Works*, ii. 479 ; Bohn's Standard Library. The passage is slightly abridged.

it, and has to lead others into the paths of goodness and sanctity, we shall feel how important are the qualifications required to discharge it. We cannot possibly think little of preaching. It is the most important thing in the world.

Milton said that poetry should be simple, sensuous, and passionate. The second word has rather changed its meaning since Milton's time. Let me put in its place the word 'vivid.' Preaching, like poetry, should be simple, vivid, passionate.

It must be simple. Nowadays nearly all our Sunday schools are graded. Why is this? Because it is so immensely difficult to teach children of seven and fourteen, and young people of seventeen, at the same time and in the same way. But we preachers have in our congregations all ages, all levels of intelligence—some highly literary, others almost illiterate; some trained to think, others largely untrained—and we have to give something to all. It is a most difficult task. Unless we are simple, we shall fail from the very beginning.

But let us remember two things. Firstly, simplicity does not exclude depth. The simple is not the superficial. Rather, many of the deepest truths are the simplest. In the Psalms how simply the search of the human heart after God and its satisfaction in Him are described—man thirsting for God, following hard after Him, stretching out his hands, and calling out 'My God,' finding joy in His forgiveness, hiding in His secret place, having fullness of joy in His presence, and pleasures for evermore at His right hand. The mother-truths of religion with which as preachers we are concerned—the love of God, the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, the fellowship of the Spirit, the hungers and thirsts of the human heart, the bread of life, the forgiveness of sins, the new birth—all these are wonderfully deep, yet wonderfully simple.

Secondly, simplicity is not the same as plainness in a bad sense. Often the simple is the beautiful. The Parthenon

is one of the simplest buildings in the world, and nothing could be simpler than the words in which Bunyan describes the picture in the House of the Interpreter : ' It stood as if it did plead with men, and a crown of gold was upon His head.'

Let me mention two ways in which we must aim at simplicity. We must be simple in our language. In the Gospels there is hardly one hard word. In that hymn the first verse of which is

Breathe on me, Breath of God :
Fill me with life anew,
That I may love what Thou dost love,
And do what Thou dost do,

there is a transparent simplicity. Nearly all the words are of one syllable. In the first verse there are twenty-five words : only one of them has more than one syllable. That is the language of the preacher. We must learn to choose the simple instead of the harder word. Often this means the choice of the native English word instead of a word of Latin or Greek origin. Of the two following, which mean the same, ' Is your maternal relative cognizant with your absence from the domiciliary residence ? ' and ' Does your mother know you're out ? ' there cannot be any doubt which is the more effective utterance. Part of Spurgeon's greatness as a preacher was that he had such a mastery of homely English speech, of the strong Anglo-Saxon words. This habit of choosing the simple word cannot be mastered in a week or a month, but any one who will seriously take himself in hand will be abundantly repaid in the course of the years. It was by doing this that John Wesley acquired his simple, lucid style. In his younger days he preached a polished and learned sermon to a congregation, but he saw that they understood hardly any of it. He struck out some of the hard words, and the result was better. But he was determined to get down to bed-rock : so he read one of his sermons to a servant-maid, and asked her to stop him when

there was anything she did not understand. Her 'Stop, sir' came so often that, at first, Wesley hovered between impatience and despair. But he persevered, substituting a simple word for a learned one, and in the end he found that his congregations could follow all he said. The influence of the mysterious Gandhi is not altogether easy to understand, but one reason for it is his homely speech in Hindi.

Secondly, we become simple by thinking out our message. When things are thought out they become simpler. If our thinking is incomplete and hazy, there can be no dominating simplicity in our sermons. Here books can help us in part, and we should read the best books in theology, but in the end, as no one can digest our food for us, so no one can do our thinking for us. Many sermons fail simply because we are not prepared for the trouble of thinking things out. Between a passage striking us in its first imaginative splendour and the finished sermon, there must be a long and laborious process of thought in which we pierce to the very heart of the text, to its inmost bread. In our English Version there is a passage in Jeremiah to which I often turn, 'Thy words were found, and I did eat them.' Probably the original does not mean that, but the same idea comes in Ezekiel. We have to chew, to masticate, to digest our texts. It is out of such travail that simplicity and lucidity are born. Let us aim at a noble simplicity. As God said to Habbakuk, 'Write the vision, and make it plain upon tables that he may run that readeth it.'

To pass to Milton's second word, our preaching must be vivid, imaginative. We want the utmost simplicity clothed in the rich colours of the imagination. In our preaching we have to impress, arrest people who are not supremely concerned about religion. To them the spiritual world is dim, remote, far off. It is only one interest in their lives among many—and often a faint one. In the introduction to Goethe's *Faust* there is a conversation between the Manager of the Theatre and the Poet, and the Manager

seeks to bring home to the latter the kind of people for whom he is writing. 'Only look,' he says, 'for whom you are writing. One is wearied and bored, another comes from some sumptuous banquet, and, worst of all, many come from reading the newspapers. With confused and scattered mind they come. They are half-cold, half-raw,' and then after the play they go into the darkness, one to a game at cards, another to a wild and sensual night. Such, says the Manager to the Poet, are the people you have to impress. And something of the same is true of those to whom we preach. Before they come to us they have been talking of motoring, golf, football, sport, and many other things: they have been reading the newspapers. And during the week that lies in front they are looking forward to money-making, pleasures, dances, pictures, theatres. And in between, with all these things buzzing, surging in their souls, they come to us, and we have to impress them, stamp God and Christ, and sin and goodness, and eternity on their minds. It is a most difficult task. How can it be accomplished? When Isaiah had to face the difficulty he took a great placard and in bold letters he wrote his message upon it. And we need something of the vividness of the placard about our preaching. Paul said to the Galatians that he placarded Christ crucified before them.

I remember years ago when I was at the pictures with my brother, he turned to me and said, 'What chance has preaching against this?' We too must preach in vivid pictures. How are we to do it?

Firstly, there must be vividness in our language. We must find the beautiful word, the haunting phrase. But we must do it naturally, without any straining after effect. A vivid word is like a match that is suddenly lighted in a dark room. And it is arresting. Let me refer to the exquisite lines of Keats:

Then felt I like some watcher of the sky,
When a new planet swims into his ken.

How largely the haunting beauty of these two lines is made by the picturesque words and phrases! The changing of any of them would spoil the beauty. Put, for 'the watcher of the skies,' 'the astronomer'; for 'swims,' 'comes'; and for 'ken,' 'field of observation'—and read it as, 'Then felt I like an astronomer when a new planet comes into his field of observation'—and all the magic has gone. How the Bible abounds in vivid words and phrases! 'The stars in their courses fought against Sisera.' 'Saul and Jonathan were swifter than eagles; they were stronger than lions.' Jeremiah speaks of a burning fire shut up in his bones, and in Isa. xxxiii. there is that passage of haunting charm :

Thine eyes shall see the King in his beauty :
They shall behold the land that is very far off.

In the Parable of the Prodigal Son there are the words, 'Bring forth quickly the best robe, and put it on him; and put a ring on his hand, and shoes on his feet, and bring the fatted calf and kill it,' and how terrible is the vividness of those words of Jesus about the outer darkness where is the weeping and gnashing of teeth!

How are we to learn the secret of lighting on the vivid word? By reading the best literature, especially the Bible and poetry. Illustrations of this from the Bible have just been given, and I have often noticed that the preachers who have the most unfailing sense of the striking and vivid word by which a whole sentence may be filled with purple and gold are those who are great readers of poetry. Even if it is only for a short time each day, the influence of this pursued year after year is incalculable.

Secondly, we must avoid the abstract and seek the concrete. Let me illustrate. Theologians speak of the prevenient grace of God. How concretely and vividly Jeremiah expressed it! He speaks on two or three occasions of God getting up early in the morning to send His messages. One can never forget that phrase. How dull prevenient grace

sounds ! How vivid is the thought of God getting up early in the morning, at five o'clock, or, like John Wesley, at four o'clock ! I sometimes wonder if Jeremiah found it hard to get up himself. Again, how concretely Jesus expresses the same truth in the Parable of the Prodigal Son : ' And while he was yet afar off, his father saw him, and was moved with compassion and ran and fell on his neck and kissed him.' To take another illustration, our Catechism formerly spoke of God as the infinite and eternal Spirit : Jesus calls Him Father. We all know what a Father is : we do not all know what an infinite and eternal Spirit is : I doubt if any of us do.

Part of the greatness of the preaching of Dr. Jowett was that he was so utterly concrete. The last time I heard him, he delivered a wonderful sermon which had a great influence. As I followed that sermon, at times almost breathless, I noticed that there was hardly anything abstract about it from beginning to end. It was all in pictures.

That leads me to say something of illustrations. They are more precious than the gold of Ophir. They refresh flagging interest : they rest the mind : they impress the imagination, and drive truth home. How could the disciples forget prayer when Jesus had told them the story of the unjust judge ! Illustrations do for a whole sermon, or for a section of a sermon, what a word may do for a sentence. Often the final effect of our sermons depends on our illustrations. Many a sermon I can now recall because it contained an illustration I could not forget.

How are we to find illustrations ? Wide reading is useful, but something else is better—observation, what Milton calls steady observation, of life. Life—everyday life—abounds in illustrations : we need eyes to see them. Careful and sympathetic observation, sometimes of the deeper aspects of life, and sometimes of what seems its more trivial detail, will furnish us with many. And the mind which is in fellowship with God will see Him in things which will be

hidden from the careless mind and the unresponsive heart. Would Jeremiah have found those two illustrations in the almond-tree and the seething cauldron, unless his mind had been filled with the prophetic vocation which God had laid upon him ?

Thirdly, preaching must be passionate. What is passion ? It is that quality which we find in Ps. xxxix., in our Lord's lament over Jerusalem, in Rom. vii., in *Othello* and *King Lear*, and in the greatest music. It is deep insight and conviction coupled with great intensity of feeling. Never let us be afraid of genuine emotion in preaching. We have not half enough of it to-day.

The following passage in which Newman speaks of his coming departure from the Anglican Church is brim-full of it. He is addressing in passionate appeal the Church he is to leave. 'O mother of saints ! O school of the wise ! O nurse of the heroic !—of whom went forth, in whom have dwelt, memorable names of old. O thou from whom surrounding nations lit their lamps ! O my mother, whence is this unto thee, that thou hast good things poured upon thee, and canst not keep them, and bearest children, yet darest not own them ? Who hath put this note upon thee, to have "a miscarrying womb and dry breasts," to be strange to thine own flesh and thine eye cruel towards thy little ones ? Thine own offspring, the fruit of thy womb, who love thee and would toil for thee, thou dost gaze upon with fear, as though a portent, or thou dost loathe as an offence : at best thou dost but endure to be rid of them as easily as thou mayest. Thou makest them stand idle all the day, as the very condition of thy bearing with them ; and thou biddest them begone, where they will be the more welcome ; or thou sellest them for naught to the stranger that passes by. And what wilt thou do in the end thereof ?'

Now the insight and the conviction which must be at the

'Sermon on 'The Parting of Friends,' in Newman's *Sermons on Subjects of the Day*. Quoted in an abridged form.

heart of all healthy emotion can only come from living experience. We need actual experience of the great realities before we can preach them. Why could Isaiah preach about righteousness? Because, in that experience which made him a prophet, he was brought face to face with the righteousness of God. He saw God seated on the throne of the universe, high and lifted up: his ears were filled with the hymn of the seraphim, 'Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of Hosts.' Flash after flash of vivid perception showed him what the righteousness of God was like. Seeing it, he was utterly broken-hearted about himself. But God wounds to heal. And, having seen the eternal righteousness and been reconciled to it, he became a preacher. And that is the only way in which a preacher can be made.

Take sin, for example, about which there is such an ominous silence in the pulpit to-day. What can a man know of sin by any amount of reading about it? It is only if sin and penitence have been felt—yes, and felt again and again—in living experience that the preacher can have any real knowledge of it. Unless he has felt it himself, there will be no conviction, no passion in his voice as he speaks about it.

And how can we preach the Cross, unless, when our heart was smitten through and through with a sense of sin, we came to know the wonder of the pardoning love of God? There are stars too distant to be seen with the eye of sense, or even with a telescope. But a photographic plate is exposed for a long while, and carefully screened from earthly light, and then the stars come out on it. So there are truths which cannot be read by the eye of sense: they have to be imprinted on the heart. And the Cross is one of these. Unless we know it in our own experience, we cannot preach it. Years ago, as far back as 1917, I was meeting with a small group of ministers in London. Again and again in that group the Cross was burnt into our lives. Years later a member of that little company told me that after one of those meetings he had gone home and made a sermon on

the Cross. And he added, ' With that sermon I have never failed to gain converts.'

And how can we preach with passionate conviction the heights and depths of Christian perfection to which as Methodist preachers we are committed, unless, in experiences that we can never forget, we have seen all that the grace of God can do, so that the word ' impossible ' is swept right out of our vocabulary ? That was the conviction of early Methodism.

I can, I do believe in Thee
All things are possible to me.

Is it any wonder that its members believed so fervently in Christian perfection ?

For the preacher there is no substitute for immediate, personal knowledge of the spiritual truths and forces about which he has to speak. One ounce of experience, if I may so put it, is worth a ton of books. And I do not undervalue books. I have learnt more of God and of His grace in Jesus Christ in a few minutes of deep experience than in years of theological reading.

Without experience, there can be no passion ; and, without passion, preaching loses its soul. It is by passion that men are arrested, stirred, and transformed. Wit and humour entertain them for a passing hour ; cleverness they admire and then forget ; but passion grips and compels and changes men's outlook and life. And our Church has had passion. A favourite phrase of our fathers had reference to a passion for souls. We have had it. Can we recover it ?

And living experience does something else for the preacher which nothing else can do. It makes him the man he ought to be, and without that all his passion will be counterfeit. Let me again refer to Milton. He who would be a true poet, and speak well of laudable things, ' ought himself to be a true poem ; that is, a composition and pattern of the best and

honourablest things; not presuming to sing high praises of heroic men, or famous cities, unless he have in himself the experience and practice of all that is praiseworthy.' And if the life of the poet must be a poem, how much more must our lives be sermons in the truth we preach! How often and how miserably we fail here! Our life should be before our hearers, as in a book an illustration lies by the side of the text. You remember how in the Letter to the Philippians, after Paul has spoken of the things which are pure, and lovely, and of good report, he says, 'Think on these things, those things which ye both learned and received and heard and saw in ME.' The illustration is there, whether we intend it or not. People do set our lives beside our sermons. I am afraid that it has some of the effect that a caricature would have beside some grave and elevated discourse. He who would be a true preacher must make his life into a sermon. Unless the truth as it is in Jesus has changed us, it will not change our hearers. Dr. Pusey's wife once asked him why he could not preach as well as Newman. Pusey answers this at length. 'I see many reasons why John's statements of truth should be attractive, and mine repulsive. He has lived a steady Christian life, and I have not. I have studied Christian evidences, when I should have studied the Bible. I have studied German evidences, when he was studying the Scriptures. I was busy, when he was tranquil. I was self-indulgent, when he was self-denying.' I do not know how far these words are true; but, if true, they go far to explain the difference between the two. Pusey seems to be hard; the other winds himself round and round the soul. Again I say, if we are to be true preachers, our lives must be great sermons. And only one thing can make them that—if God's own Word has come and filled them.

And these qualities about which I have been speaking

must all be consecrated to one supreme end—bringing others into Jesus Christ's way of living, into His fellowship with God and His abounding sympathy with and love and service of man. The preacher cannot range as he likes round a large circumference. He is bound to a living centre. He has one definite thing to do. Dr. Orchard once said of Congregational preaching that it was very good preaching, but about nothing in particular. And that fault is not confined to any one Church. Jeremiah puts it in even plainer words :

They have forsaken Me,
The fountain of living waters,
And have hewed them out cisterns,
Broken cisterns,
That can hold no water.

In preaching we have something very particular to do—to declare the Word of God. If we fail to do it, no amount of other success means anything. If we accomplish it, weakness elsewhere is of little moment.

Let us consecrate ourselves anew to our great vocation. Let us appeal, more often than we have done, for immediate decisions. I remember walking home with my father from the last Synod we ever attended together. We were talking of preaching. Amongst other things, he said, ' If I had my ministry over again, I would appeal, much more often than I have done, for immediate decision for Christ.' Do not let us forget the appeal in which the sermon reaches its goal.

Years ago there was a phrase from Ps. lxxiii. which stuck like a knife in my heart. The writer speaks of dealing treacherously with the generation of God's children. If we are slack and careless in our preaching, in our preparation for speaking the Word of God, we are dealing treacherously with the generation of God's children. Our privileges are many. That we may have leisure, that we may spend the spacious hours of the morning in quiet, delightful studies, others are working in business-house and on farm, they are toiling in mine and factory and forge.

We have been set apart by what we believe are the providential arrangements of society, for we are men who have received a call, that we may take to these busy people what should be nothing less than the Word of God. Walt Whitman once said that he had the ambition 'to carry ray of sun, or smell of grass or corn, or call of bird, or gleam of stars by night, or snow-flakes falling fresh and mystic, to denizen of heated city-house, or tired workman or workwoman, or to some fevered mouth or languishing pulse.' And we know of even brighter stars, and more radiant suns, of fairer landscapes and more undying flowers, and we have to carry them from the Word which God has revealed to us to an age which has had so much bad news that it is longing to hear good news. And this good news we have. It is the eternal gospel of the blessed God.

J. ARUNDEL CHAPMAN.

Leonard Bacon. A Statesman in the Church. By Theodore Davenport Bacon. Edited by Benjamin B. Bacon. (H. Milford. 80s.) Dr. Bacon died in 1881 but the value of this biography prepared as a family memorial is enhanced by the half century that has elapsed since his work was finished. His father was a missionary to the Indians and had a life of privation and disappointment. His son Leonard was trained at Hartford and at Yale and spent forty years as a Congregational minister at New Haven, where he gradually took rank as one of the leaders of his communion. He had a large share in the movement for 'Progressive Orthodoxy' which loosened the shackles of severe Calvinism. He was also a foremost leader in the Anti-slavery movement. His *Essays on Slavery* did much to shape Lincoln's thinking on the subject. Lincoln's verdict was, 'He is quite a man.' Bacon took an active part in founding the *Independent*, which became the leading religious paper of the country. When he resigned his pastorate he was appointed acting Professor in the Divinity School at Yale and afterwards Lecturer in Ecclesiastical Polity and American Church History. He had many anxieties over the charges made against his friend Ward Beecher whose innocence he was convinced of, despite his want of prudence in the whole business. Bacon was by no means a popular preacher but he was a man whose absolute sincerity and courage made him trusted and honoured by all who worked with him. The biography is a mirror of the times and will be of eminent service to all who wish really to understand the critical years from 1825 to 1860 when he played a prominent part in the religious and social life of the United States.

THE RUSSIAN PROBLEM.

THE proverb that truth lies at the bottom of a well was never more strikingly illustrated than in the case of Russia to-day. Every visitor to that tragic and mysterious land professes to tell us the facts. But the reports are so conflicting that we are utterly bewildered. It is not easy to ascertain the facts. Many visitors are only allowed to see what the authorities wish them to see. Some witnesses are manifestly biased ; others badly informed. In one sense this is not surprising. Russia is so vast, its population so huge and varied, that with the best will possible visitors can see only a mere fraction of what is to be seen.

Vidkun Quisling, a Norwegian, has had quite exceptional opportunities of learning the facts at first hand over a prolonged period, having lived under Bolshevism almost without a break since the beginning of the Revolution. He is convinced that an unspeakably dangerous enemy is threatening our civilization, and primarily the British Empire. This enemy is Bolshevism, the master of Russia and the champion of world revolution. We must look at things with Bolshevik eyes if we are to understand its work in the world. The name was a puzzle when first it came into use. It originated in a schism in the Russian Labour Party which occurred at the congress in London in 1903, when the party divided (without an actual break) into two sections : revolutionary Communists and reformist Socialists. The former, led by Lenin, were in the majority (Russian, *bolshinstvo*), and thus came to be styled Bolsheviks. This Communist Party rules Russia as the Fascist Party rules Italy. The form of administration

¹ *Russia and Ourselves*, by Vidkun Quisling (Hodder & Stoughton, 7s. 6d.); *The Clash of World Forces: A Study in Nationalism, Bolshevism, and Christianity*, by Basil Matthews (Edinburgh House Press, 2s.); *The New Russia: Eight Talks Broadcast* (Faber & Faber, 3s. 6d.)

in Russia is a dictatorship. Nominally this dictatorship is in the hands of the Party Congress, but in reality is exercised by the dominant group in the Congress, known as the Central Committee, and within that again by a few men who form its Executive Committee. This is the so-called Political Bureau, in which Stalin, the actual ruler of Russia, is paramount. To hark back for a political parallel, Stalin rules Russia as Robespierre ruled France by means of the Committee of Safety.

Bolshevism has done good work for the improvement of sanitary conditions and the promotion of sport, but it has set itself to stamp out the best peasant stock, evicting them from their homes and driving them off like herds of cattle to the wilderness of North Russia and Siberia, where they die by the thousand. The body politic has taken over not only the political activities of the community, but all its economic, social, and cultural life as well. No man's life, freedom, or property is safe in Russia, if the interests of the State are involved. Personal abuses of power abound. Civil liberties, freedom of thought, speech, and writing, safeguards against the abuses of power of the State—all are gone. Russia is a vast prison, in which the citizens do not enjoy the elementary right to leave or enter their own country. By means of this *Dictatorship of the Proletariat* the Bolshevists apparently intend to eliminate the other classes of society.

'Soviet,' which means council, is the sign manual of the system, but the Soviet elections are a farce. If the statements of Mr. William Zukerman in the *Contemporary Review* are correct, our author has not fully stated the case in regard to the Jews. Mr. Zukerman asserts that the Soviet Government has solved the age-long problem of the Jews. A grant of nearly a million acres of the most fertile land in Russia to the old Jewish inhabitants of the Pale has been made. These townsmen, though economically ruined and without the slightest means of subsistence, have eagerly taken up the land offered and are making a success of it. Then the Five

Year Plan provides for 265,000 Jews being employed in the next three years in heavy industries, skilled labour, and in other ways. It will be observed that in this, as in so many other things, these exploits are largely in the future. Then, Jews engaged successfully in agriculture and heavy industries sounds doubtful.

In Russia, the peasant question takes precedence of all others, for eighty per cent. of the population are peasants. Land problems lie at the root of the whole political situation. The history of the Russian peasant, from the earliest times, is here dealt with, and the effect of the Revolution on this important class indicated. The enormous disorganization it occasioned nearly brought about the collapse of the Bolshevik administration; and in the villages the class war is raging more furiously than ever. On being forced to enter the collective farms, the peasants slaughtered their livestock. This has reduced the meat available for the towns to less than a third of pre-war rate. The policy aims at the extinction of the *kulaks*, or well-to-do peasants, by excluding them from these collective farms, confiscating their property, and banishing them and their families. 'Our labour has become our enemy,' is the significant remark of a Siberian peasant. As Dr. Margaret S. Miller puts it in *The New Russia*, 'Everywhere in Russia one is struck by this contrast: the lavish magnificence of new construction, construction that would be remarkable even in a wealthy country; and the present poverty, the uncomprehending misery of so many millions, who are the unconscious and unwilling instruments of this magnificence.' Or, as H. R. Knickerbocker has it in the same book: 'The Plan is a method for Russia to starve itself great.'

When we come to social conditions, we find that owners of houses were turned out or killed. The furniture was portioned out, a family occupying each room, the original owner, if still alive, being allowed a cellar. This in the towns. When estates were pillaged in the country, things were still

worse. (Not equality but a caste system is the result, with four categories, and the Bolshevik aristocracy at the top.) Two hundred roubles a month is the standard wage even for members of the party, but with sundry amenities and perquisites for men at the top. In the country, however, the peasant's budget does not as a rule exceed the two hundred roubles a year; and a pair of boots will cost forty to fifty roubles. In the towns, hardly a decent home exists. The majority have one room, with floor-space equal to what is got at last in the churchyard. A five-room flat will have six or seven families, all using the same kitchen. The more untidy the house, the better; so avoiding the reputation of being a bourgeois and the undesirable attentions of the tax-collector. In the expenditure, vodka figures largely, like suicides in the statistics of mortality. Has the position of the workers been improved by the Revolution? No, say the older men; yes, say the younger. A working week of five days, and the abolition of Saturday and Sunday, gives a weekly holiday distributed all over the week on the group system, so that a family can rarely enjoy a holiday together. As an economic and social unit the family is to be split up, man and wife living in separate lodgings, no longer bound by any mutual ties, the children living and being educated away from their parents. Of course, the reaction against the old Tsarist system accounts for much; and, while the pros and cons are well set out, the final conclusion is that social justice is not attainable by way of a Communist social revolution.

The section on culture and religion will at once arrest the reader's attention. A brief historical *résumé* leads up to the last century, when a really independent national Russian culture developed. This, however, touched only the aristocracy. The masses of the Russian people were still plunged in the deepest ignorance. The Revolution destroyed this borrowed culture, giving place to an imported set of Marxist ideas. There is to be a Socialist culture, the warp of which will be the spirit of Russia, the woof the Marxist view of life.

However unscrupulous Bolshevism may be, it has its philosophic side. That philosophy, if philosophy it can be called, is atheism and materialism. A Socialist may be neither : a Communist must be both, in theory and in practice. Bolshevism demands possession of the whole man, and invades every department of human activity. Were it not for the prevailing materialism, the worship of Lenin would become a religion. Basing everything on the world revolution and the establishment of the Socialist order, the result is utter confusion and corruption both of idea and of morals. It is a condition of joining the Communist Party that all religious belief shall be renounced. Basil Matthews makes this abundantly clear in his book. Lenin said, ' Religion is an opiate of the people, a sort of spiritual vodka meant to make the slaves of capitalism tread in the dust their human form and their aspirations to a semi-decent existence.' In the fields of morals Bolshevism is just as drastic. To quote Lenin again : ' We repudiate all morality which proceeds from supernatural ideas, or ideas which are outside class conceptions. In our view, morality is entirely subordinate to the interests of the class war ; everything is moral which is necessary for the annihilation of the old exploiting social order and for the uniting of the proletariat.'

Bolshevism cannot tolerate the existence of any rival sect ; so ever since it came into power it has carried on religious persecution. It began by confiscating seven millions of acres of land from the churches and monasteries ; the clergy were disfranchized and forbidden to teach, while about a thousand monasteries and convents were closed. Then the churches were relieved of a large part of the valuables which ' superstition ' had collected. We are told that the plan of campaign is to proclaim religious liberty, and simultaneously suppress religion by persecution, imprisonment, banishment, and shooting. Churches, synagogues, meeting-houses, mosques, are demolished or converted into clubs, eating-houses, or cinemas. Striking examples show that to Bolshevik Russia

liberty of thought and religious freedom are simply inconceivable. The only liberty is to think as Lenin or Marx thought. The dominating feature of Bolshevistic policy is the complete annihilation of all that is commonly termed religion. But if the advance is tentative and diplomatic, it is advance all the time. Leninism confidently anticipates that the proper education of the young will result, after one or two generations, in the complete eradication of religion from Soviet Russia.

It is only fair to remember that the old religion of Russia was time-serving, corrupt, superstitious. This gives Bolshevism, with its anti-religious mania, a tremendous advantage; but, with all that, the sympathies of the great mass of the people are not with their rulers. As is invariably the case, the fascination of the old days has increased threefold. Hence the fear of the Church on the part of the Bolsheviks. Vast numbers of Russians see quite clearly that the success of Bolshevik principles must destroy the whole fabric of morality; and that its aim is to subvert all freedom of thought and development. Science and the arts and education—everything, in fact—is subordinated to ‘the development of propaganda for Communistic ideas on the most far-reaching lines, and the utilization to this end of the organization and funds of the State.’

An interesting discussion of the racial basis of Bolshevism brings out the fact that Socialism is mainly prevalent in the short-skulled Alpine race, which includes the bulk of the lower classes in central Europe and the majority of the Slav inhabitants of eastern Europe. Bolshevism as a mass movement exists chiefly in those parts of Russia where there is most Asiatic blood in the Slav population. The sharpest antagonisms in the world to-day, ‘especially perhaps in my own country of Norway and in Germany, amount in the last resort to a duel between the Nordic-European principle and the Asiatic-Oriental principle, i.e. Bolshevism.’ On a wide front, Marxism is based on a complete system worked out to

the last detail, which embraces every department of human life, and provides a universal philosophy which is skilfully made acceptable to the masses. A truly religious and responsible philosophy of life has no place in its ideals and propaganda.

Perhaps the most lurid chapter in this remarkable book is that entitled 'Russia as an Example.' Some of its statements seem almost incredible. Multitudes have only the vaguest idea what Bolshevism has meant, and still means, in Russia. In its first period it meant 'the most appalling destruction, which reduced the country's industries to less than one-fifth of what they had been, agriculture to less than one half, and money to nothing, *wiped out twenty million people*, and ruined the lives of a still greater number.' How many outside Russia can realize what that means? Two questions are here suggested: Can Communism really last in Russia? And does it give any help towards the solution of the burning world-question: Capitalism versus Socialism? The author thinks it is yet too early to pronounce a definite judgement in regard to the first query, though he is of opinion that the peasant policy, the policy of nationalities and the suicidal racial policy, with the mutual reactions of Russia and the world, must sooner or later bring about the ruin of the Bolsheviks; but he warns his readers against underrating the power of the Bolsheviks in the direction of world revolution. A later section will return to this question.

Discussing the relative merits of Capitalism and Socialism, the author holds that, in the purely physical domain, the whole movement stands condemned. It is not merely the fearful loss of life involved, but the destruction of the *intelligentzia*, the most valuable human material in Russia: 'The racial loss is a sin against the Holy Ghost of history, not to be forgiven here or hereafter.' Such are the things we are invited to repeat. To pretend that such things could not happen in our more civilized countries is folly. During the short time the revolution lasted in Finland it

involved the loss of some 20,000 lives. In Russia the Revolution has entailed a loss in manufacturing and agricultural industries of £20,000,000,000, a loss increasing every year. A revolutionary earthquake of a similar kind would shatter a Western community and turn it into a desert. 'Socialism as an economic system has been utterly compromised by the Russian example, both in its revolutionary and reformist aspects.' The lack of economic liberty, of unity of command, the incredible prevalence of fruitless bureaucratic method, with its orgy of statistics and its interminable red-tape, clearly prove this. The disastrous consequences of introducing politics into trade and industry, to say nothing of the disregard of the elementary principles of human nature, with its demand for the enjoyment of the fruits of its labour, point in the same direction. These statements, fully elaborated, are based upon actual experience and observation.

Universal revolution is the aim of Soviet foreign policy, with its dream of the organization of a world-wide union of Socialist Soviet Republics. So far the success has been phenomenal, reaching throughout Asia as far as the frontiers of old Russia. Many opposing factors remain, in spite of the Revolution—the position of Russia, e.g., as a world power between Europe and Asia ; the northern half Finnish-Asiatic, the southern half Turkish-Asiatic. This has constituted a great dilemma for statesmen, past and present, typified by the old Russian eagle, gazing eastward with one head, westward with the other. The foreign ambitions of Russia are to-day world-wide. Its aim is the destruction of the powers of the great European States as capitalistic and imperialistic. In short, it is the liberation of all the oppressed classes and nations throughout the world in a union of Socialist republics, where no nation will exercise really sovereign power.

The Clash of World Forces brings out the part Bolshevism is playing alike in India and China. The history of Gandhi in the one and Sun-Yat-Sen in the other is significant of much. In both, Bolshevism touches the British Empire,

with which the next paragraph is concerned. Regarding England as the chief obstacle to world revolution, her injury is the dominant aim of Bolshevism. Directly or indirectly she must be crippled, especially in India. The most effective means of accomplishing this purpose are propaganda, dumping, and a revolutionary movement among the workers. Thus our present difficulties in India will be increased in every possible way.

Opinions differ as to the real significance of the warlike preparations of Bolshevism. The fact that the military vote of the last five years has risen from 600 to 1,500 million roubles, or 800 million roubles above that of the Tsar's Government before the war, is hardly a gesture of peace. Still more significant is the fact that the Red Army is established all over the world. True, the economic question dominates everything; time is the first consideration; and Russia is still a giant with feet of clay.

Marxism is a religion of hate. Any alliance of the Nordic peoples, if alliance there is to be, must aim at a just and peaceable solution of the social problem on the basis of a religion of love. The Americans are far more alarmed than ourselves in regard to the reactions of the Five Year Plan on trade and industry. Perhaps it is that they understand better its real significance. But here, as elsewhere, the clash of world forces can find solution only on Christian principles. This survey of the Russian problem will at least reveal the magnitude of the problem, and the demands it will make on a wise, firm, enlightened Christian statesmanship.

JOSEPH RITSON.

SOCRATES AND JESUS: THEIR TRIALS AND DEATHS

IN the year 800 B.C., the Athenians condemned Socrates to death. From Greece the Western world derives its intellectual life—science, art, literature. The philosophies of Greece have shaped Western thought, but the philosopher, who has seemed to succeeding ages to show the Greek genius at its perfection, was condemned to death by his fellow citizens.

Four hundred years later, Jesus was crucified at Jerusalem. As Greece is the source of Western learning and art, so is Palestine the source of Western religion. Faith in the unseen, the concept of the presence and power of the divine in human affairs, the stern contrast between right and wrong are found nowhere as in Jewish literature. But the man who was to fulfil the Jewish religious ideas and carry them all over the world was judged worthy of death by his own people.

Socrates and Jesus have often been compared and Socrates has been called a forerunner of Jesus. The points of likeness between their trials and the reasons for which they were condemned are striking and have been fully recognized; but the more one thinks about the last days of these two men, the more profound appear the differences; four hundred years separated them; one was an Athenian and the other a Jew; the one was guided by his clear, detached intellect, the other inherited the spiritual intensity of the Hebrew prophets; one was an old man of seventy who had lived a well-filled life and who said himself, 'When a man has reached my age he ought not to be repining at the approach of death'; the other was thirty-four and had apparently failed miserably.

An examination of the circumstances makes clearer the resemblances and differences. There are two descriptions

of the trial and death of Socrates written by disciples with great literary powers. They are in substantial agreement, and Xenophon's *Memorabilia* is therefore evidence to the truth of the picture of Socrates presented by Plato. Xenophon was away for two years on the March of the Ten Thousand to Babylon and did not return to Athens till after the death of Socrates; he quotes the testimony of their common friend Hermogenes. Plato was present at the trial, and in the *Apology*, the *Crito*, and the *Phaedo* wrote an account which still holds the imagination of the world. For the trial and death of Jesus we have, first, the Synoptic Gospels, bare recitals of the facts by uneducated men, and, secondly, the account of St. John, which may, perhaps, be compared with that of Plato, since both are coloured by the imagination of the writer, true to the spirit, rather than accurate in literal detail. The records are taken as they stand, and no attempt is made to discuss their authenticity. The translations used are Jowett's Plato and the Authorized Version of the Gospels.

The accusation against Socrates ran: 'Socrates is an evil-doer, a corrupter of the youth, who does not receive the gods whom the State receives, but introduces other new divinities.' Jesus was charged with similar but bolder transgressions: 'We found this fellow perverting the nation.' 'He made Himself the Son of God.' To influence the Roman governor, political charges were brought: that He claimed to be 'King of the Jews,' and, quite untruly, that he forbade giving tribute to Caesar.

Socrates and Jesus stirred the minds and consciences of their contemporaries, unsettled them with regard to the established religion, and taught a simpler and higher morality. Each claimed to be acting under divine inspiration. Socrates was convinced that his mission was imposed upon him by God, and believed in a spirit, or daimon, 'a sort of voice that comes to me and, when it comes, it always holds me back, but never urges me forward.' The relationship of

Jesus to spiritual guidance was closer : ' I and My Father are one,' ' I came to do the will of Him that sent Me.' It is a measure of their power that their death became inevitable—it was the only way of stopping activities which had become seriously disturbing. Socrates described himself as a gad-fly, stinging the Athenians and urging them to righteousness, and said at his trial, ' Either acquit me or not ; but, whichever you do, understand that I shall never alter my ways, not even if I have to die many times.' The growing influence of Jesus alarmed the scribes and chief priests, who said, ' Behold the world is gone after Him,' and, after His entry into Jerusalem, and His vigorous dealing with the money-changers of the Temple, ' they sought how they might destroy Him, for they feared Him because all the people were astonished at His teaching.' It was Jesus' actions at Jerusalem that brought the feeling against Him to a head : in the very stronghold of authority He openly denounced the scribes and Pharisees while ' all the people hung on Him listening.' He showed Himself their master even on their own ground of argument, for when they tried ' to catch Him in His words ' he confuted them out of their own mouths by a direct appeal to facts—for instance, His masterly evasion of the pitfall of the tribute-money : ' Bring Me a penny . . . Whose is this image and superscription ? '

The immediate cause of the accusation against Socrates was less definite. Since he was quite a young man he had openly discussed his philosophical problems, but in 899 B.C. the Athenians were nervous. Athens had concluded disastrous wars and had lost her empire ; the democracy had recently been restored after the hated rule of the Thirty ; Socrates was thought to be unpatriotic, and it was one of the charges against him that Critias, Charmides, and Alcibiades, who had conspired against the democracy, were his disciples. The particular occasion for the charge of impiety does not appear.

It would have been easy for either Socrates or Jesus to

avoid condemnation if he had been willing to give up his mission. The Athenians would have been relieved if Socrates had quietly left the city before the trial, and, after the sentence had been passed, Crito urged him to escape, and he and other friends were eager to provide the means. Socrates refused to consider it. 'It is not hard to escape death,' he said ; 'it is harder to escape unrighteousness.'

Jesus need not have gone to Jerusalem for the Passover. He told His disciples exactly what would happen : 'Behold we go up to Jerusalem ; and the Son of Man shall be delivered unto the chief priests, and unto the scribes ; and they shall condemn Him to death, and shall deliver Him to the Gentiles : and they shall mock Him, and scourge Him, and shall spit upon Him, and shall kill Him.'

The actual trials were conducted in very different temper. Socrates was tried according to the ordinary Athenian procedure before the court of heliasts or dicasts. The court consisted of 501 citizens, and neither the jurors nor the president were trained in law. The verdict depended on the vote of the majority, a majority of one being sufficient to condemn. The accused spoke in his own defence and often attempted to influence the vote by appeals to pity, gratitude, and the like, and the court might be swayed by personal feeling, rather than by legal considerations. Socrates refused to make any such appeal, and said that 'there seems to be something wrong in asking a favour of the judge and thus procuring an acquittal instead of informing and convincing him.'

He did not seriously defend himself, but used the opportunity to enforce his teaching and to explain the purpose of his life. Xenophon says that his speech was bold and even imprudent, and that he wished to die before disease or the decay of old age should overtake him. He traced the origin of public feeling against him to the Delphic oracle, which had said that no man was wiser than Socrates. He had questioned men with a reputation for wisdom, and proved

that the oracle spoke truly, for these men knew nothing, but thought they were wise, whereas he, Socrates, knew that he was ignorant. Thus he had made enemies, for no one liked his ignorance to be exposed. He answered lightly and ironically the specific charges of Meletus: first, that he corrupted the youth, and, secondly, that he was an atheist; and then, becoming serious, he said that if he were offered his freedom on condition of giving up his inquiries he would refuse. 'I shall obey God, rather than you, and while I have life and strength I shall never cease from the practice and teaching of philosophy, exhorting any one whom I may meet. . . . I do nothing but go about persuading you all, young and old alike, not to take thought for your persons or your properties, but first and chiefly to care about the greatest improvement of the soul.' He said that his 'voice' or daimon, had deterred him from taking part in public affairs, for 'he who will fight for the right, if he would live even for a brief space, must have a private station, not a public one'; but he had twice in public matters shown that he preferred death to injustice. He ended this part of his speech thus: 'For I do believe that there are gods, and in a sense higher than that in which any of my accusers believe in them. And to you and to God I commit my cause, to be determined by you as is best for you and me.'

He spoke in the familiar conversational manner which he used in his teaching, and, if some of his arguments appear to us verbal quibbles, he at least followed his own moral teaching to its tragic end. 'A man who is good for anything,' he said, 'ought not to calculate the chance of living or dying; he ought only to consider whether in doing anything he is doing right or wrong.' 'Wherever a man's place is, whether the place he has chosen or that in which he has been placed by a commander, there he ought to remain in

¹ Cf. 'Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on . . . But seek ye first the Kingdom of God, and His righteousness.'

the hour of danger ; he should not think of death or any thing but of disgrace.'

Socrates stood his ground and was condemned to death by a majority of sixty votes. It was the custom for the accused to propose a counter penalty. Socrates said that doubtless some good thing was his due, and suggested that maintenance in the Prytaneum was a fitting reward for one who desired leisure to instruct others. Why should he propose an alternative penalty when he did not know whether death were good or evil ? Imprisonment was certainly an evil, a fine he had no money to pay, he could not be happy in exile. Finally he proposed the absurdly small sum of thirty minae, for which his friends stood surety.

The death sentence was confirmed, and Socrates afterwards addressed the court. To his accusers he said that his death would be a reproach to them and that they would be ' condemned by the truth to suffer the penalty of villainy and wrong.' Those who would have acquitted him he consoled with the thought that death is either good or a state like dreamless sleep and that ' no evil can happen to a good man either in life or after death.' There may have been prejudice and injustice in the trial of Socrates, but there was at least a show of fairness and dignity.

In the case of Jesus it is doubtful how far the Hebrew trial conformed to the practice of the time,¹ and at any rate it seems to have been rushed, owing to the near approach of the Passover. To us it appears monstrous that a man should be arrested one night, tried during the night and early morning, and executed at noon. Immediately after arrest, Jesus was taken before Annas, who had formerly been high priest and who still exercised great ecclesiastical power through his son-in-law, Caiaphas, ' who was high priest that year,' and through others of his family who were members of the Sanhedrin. Annas sent Jesus to Caiaphas, who called the

¹ See A. Taylor Innis, *The Trial of Jesus Christ* (Edinburgh, 1894).

Sanhedrin early in the morning. It was a principle of Jewish law that the accused must be confronted with witnesses who must agree in their testimony.¹ In the case of Jesus the witnesses did not agree. An attempt was then made to extort a confession—'Art Thou the Christ?' Jesus, who, in contrast to Socrates, had refused to defend Himself, now spoke: 'I am, and ye shall see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of power and coming in the clouds of heaven.' The whole assembly rose in a body, with shouts of blasphemy, and condemned Him to death. It was necessary to obtain confirmation of a death-sentence by the Roman governor. Jesus was therefore arraigned before Pilate the same morning. The Jewish accusers could not enter the Praetorium without losing their religious purity for the Passover, so Pilate examined Jesus and then came out to speak to the Jews. His verdict was clearly given against his sense of justice. He openly said, 'I find no fault in this man,' but he yielded, for political and personal reasons, to the clamour of the Jewish leaders. First, however, he tried to avoid the responsibility by sending Jesus to Herod, the tetrarch of Galilee. Herod was curious to see Him, and asked many questions, but to these, as to the accusation of the chief priests He gave no answer. Herod sent Him back to Pilate, who then proposed to release Him as the prisoner due to be freed at the Passover. The priests, however, worked on the people, and the whole of the waiting crowd shouted with increasing vehemence for the crucifixion of Jesus. It was evident that Jesus was creating a disturbance; more disturbance would have been caused by refusing to ratify the verdict of the Jewish court; it was nothing to Pilate one way or the other, so long as order was maintained in his disaffected province. The words, 'If thou let this man go, thou art not Caesar's friend,' touched his instinct of self-preservation and overcame his conviction

¹ See *ibid.*

that 'the chief priests had delivered him for envy.' Pilate evidently admired the dignity of Jesus, who answered his question in three words, 'Thou sayest it,' and to his voluble and persistent accusers made no answer at all. To a Roman, dealing with emotional and excitable Jews, His reserve must have been a welcome contrast.

It is the brutality of the treatment of Jesus, even more than the injustice of the verdict, which horrifies us—the haste and disorder, the hooting and mocking, the blows and taunts, and the terrible scourging which was, it seems, usual before crucifixion (Klausner). In these matters the trial of Socrates was governed by Greek restraint. Socrates was the dominating figure at his trial, he appeared to hold the mastery of the court, to lead the argument in his own way and almost to invite the sentence. Jesus also was the dominating figure, but by the power of His silence in the face of accusation and insults. He was led from one examination to another, buffeted and scorned, alone in a jostling concourse of enemies, yet, in the few words He spoke, He rose to heights immeasurably beyond His judges, and, in mystical intensity, equally beyond Socrates.

After the trial, Jesus was hurried to the place of crucifixion; Socrates, however, had thirty days to wait for the return of the sacred ship from Delos before the sentence could be carried out. This time he spent in prison, visited by his family and friends. In the *Phaedo* he is represented as pursuing with his friends a closely reasoned argument on immortality. The philosopher should be ready and even glad to die, although he must not take his own life—'Not until death will the soul attain the end which she is ever seeking. Only when she is parted from the body can she attain pure knowledge.' Step by step, in his accustomed fashion, he led his friends to acknowledge, first, that the soul existed before birth, and, next, that it will survive after death—that it will not, when it leaves the body, be blown away and scattered by the wind, but that the soul 'herself

invisible departs to the invisible world—to the divine and immortal and rational: thither arriving, she is secure of bliss and is released from the error and folly of men, their fears and wild passions, and all other human ills, and for ever dwells, as they say of the initiated, in the company with the gods.' His friends were not to think when they buried his body that they were burying Socrates.

Jesus gave His farewell message to His disciples at the supper just before He was arrested. John's account is the fullest; the other Evangelists simply record that He told them He would be betrayed by one of them and crucified; that He distributed the bread and wine with the words, 'Take, eat; this is My body,' 'this is My blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many'; that He said it was the last time He would drink the fruit of the vine on earth. Luke relates the words of Jesus about humility and service, which arose from a contention among the disciples as to who should be the greatest, and which Matthew records as having been spoken on the way to Jerusalem. 'Whosoever is chief among you, let him be your servant.' 'I am among you as He that serveth.' John adds that He washed the disciples' feet as an example. John gives a beautiful discourse in which Jesus told His disciples that they were to bear witness, and warned them of the opposition and persecution they would meet. He spoke confidently of the future and of His relations with God. Socrates had said, 'The hour of departure has arrived, and we go our ways—I to die, and you to live. Which is better, God alone knows.' Jesus spoke with assurance of drinking the fruit of the vine in His Father's Kingdom. 'I leave the world and go to the Father.' He told them of the coming of the Comforter, the Spirit of truth, and tried to show them the wonderful spiritual life that would arise in them through their love of Him and of one another and, through Him, of God. It was beyond their comprehension, but Peter must have voiced the feeling of all, when they went out to the Mount of Olives and he said

enthusiastically, 'Lord I am willing to go with Thee, both to prison and to death.' 'Though all shall be offended, yet will not I'; but Jesus was not deceived and told him plainly that he would deny Him.

The scene in the garden is perhaps the most poignant in all history, and was unparalleled in the story of Socrates. Jesus, 'exceeding sorrowful even unto death,' prayed to be spared the bitter and terrible ordeal before Him. 'Take away this cup from Me; nevertheless, not what I will, but what Thou wilt.' He asked His disciples—so far as we know, for the only time in His life—for their sympathy and prayers, and they, His friends, who had just made such splendid promises, went to sleep; and shortly after, at the moment of physical danger, 'they forsook Him and fled.'

The actual deaths of Socrates and Jesus afford another contrast. Socrates took the initiative and, with his friends gathered round him, calmly and cheerfully drank the hemlock and awaited the onset of unconsciousness. There was no wavering, no complaint, and no weakness; and the dying man sustained, and gave courage to his grieving friends. Jesus was nailed on a cross for hours, stared at and jeered at by the crowd; His physical suffering was intense and He was separated from His friends, who watched at a distance, bewildered and dismayed. Socrates remained master of the situation; Jesus—when He cried, 'My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?'—seems to have lost for the time His faith in Himself, His faith in God. He knew, as Socrates probably never knew, blank despair.

In both cases the men who had charge of the prisoners were impressed. Socrates' guard praised him as the 'noblest and gentlest and best of all who ever came to this place,' and burst into tears when the time came to bring in the poison. The centurion said of Jesus, 'Truly this man was the Son of God.'

One thing that strikes the reader of the two records is that Jesus seems to be a more passive agent than Socrates.

Socrates did what he thought right, and deliberately carried out his own teaching. Jesus did, almost unwillingly, 'the will of Him that sent Him.' The events that preceded His death seem to move inevitably to His destruction, yet in the central Figure, outwardly so quiet and passive, there was a smouldering force voluntarily suppressed. 'Thou couldst have no power at all against Me unless it were given thee from above.' Jesus reached heights and depths of emotion far removed from the restrained reasoning of Socrates. Socrates died as we should all like to die, dignified and self-possessed, but who would dare to wish for a death like that of Jesus? Can we imagine in ourselves the generosity of the prayer, 'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do'? Should we have the courage to make a promise to the penitent thief, and could we finally recover from the bitterness of disappointment and despair, and, dying, commend our spirit into the hand of God?

G. M. WAUCHOPE.

The Transition from Roman Britain to Christian England, A.D. 368-664. By Gilbert Sheldon. (Macmillan & Co. 10s.) Mr. Sheldon had finished this work before he died a year ago and his sister has seen it through the press with the help of friends. Mr. de la Mare's Memoirs and her own Remembrances add distinctly to the interest of the volume. England had long been in the peaceful occupation of Rome before the fall of the Empire and its well-being rose to its height during the first half of the fourth century. Townsfolk and country gentry became Romanized. The men of the fifth century must have looked back on the age of Constantine as a lost paradise. Light is thrown on the action of Voltigern in calling in the Teutons and on the legendary accounts of Arthur which may be embroidered versions of actual events. Gildas, who wrote about A.D. 547, is disappointing, but we can see that the influence of the Church was great and was deepening and expanding. London ranked among the chief cities of the Empire; the Midlands were a nursery of soldiers. With the arrival of Augustine Britain emerged from the partial isolation which she had suffered since the close of the Roman occupation. Ethelbert's zeal for the missionaries probably cost him his overlordship. After the defeat of Penda Northumberland took the lead not only in politics but also in culture and religion. The Synod of Whitby in 664 brought Britain into full communion with the main body of Western Christendom. This volume is one of unusual value.

TENNYSON AND FAITH

TENNYSON always refused to formulate a creed of his own. This was due partly to the feeling that people would not understand him if he did, partly to the belief that his poetry already contained the fundamentals of his faith, and partly to the conviction that religious truth could never be embodied in a set formula. But, though he always declined to give a definite statement of his religious convictions, it is, nevertheless, fairly easy to distinguish the main currents in his religious teaching. Tennyson's struggle for truth was the outcome of a great inward battle, and in that battle his convictions take form and stand out clear and strong. They may be somewhat blurred at the beginning, but they rise to a triumphant certainty at the end. Like the traveller in Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*, he forces his way through the Slough of Despond, wins his battle against Giant Despair, and passes through the dark Valley of the Shadow of Death before he reaches the Celestial City; but he does arrive at last, though with less certainty than Browning, at the assurance of that 'one far-off divine event, to which the whole creation moves.' His quest for religious truth was essentially a quest in which the soul was continually beaten and battered, not only by the critical and scientific discoveries made in the Victorian Era, but also by the more personal loss that came to him through the death of his intimate friend, Arthur Hallam.

At the same time, Tennyson sympathizes with those who possess a simple form of faith, with the girl whose eyes, like Mary's, were 'homes of silent prayer.' There are certain people who find that their doubts and perplexities vanish automatically in the presence of devoted service or of reverent worship. Like Mary of Bethany, 'all subtle thought, all curious fears,' are banished from their minds when, like her, they bathe the Saviour's feet with their tears and anoint them

with the precious spikenard. It is not for a superior faith, based on criticism, to poke fun at a simple trust like this. Such a faith may be quite as sincere as one that has been reasoned out through some intellectual process ; its sincerity is shown by what it is willing to sacrifice. In fact, its gifts are often far superior to the gifts of those whose faith has been based upon reason, rather than upon love. But, while Tennyson may envy the simple trust of such a devout believer, he knows that such a faith is not for him. The dark black night, with the storm rushing over the down, is the home from which his faith must spring.

In this struggle for religious truth, Tennyson was guided by four leading principles.

In the first place, he reminds his readers that religion is a matter of faith and not of proof. There are certain questions to which the only possible answer is a wise and reverent agnosticism. The most unreasonable people in life are often the people who demand a reason for everything. But the great facts of religion, unlike a proposition in Euclid, are not capable of mathematical demonstration. They belong to a realm that is both different in content and higher in outlook. The only test that can be employed is the test of experience. Ultimately, religion is known by its fruits. Hence the wise man, even when he is overtaken by doubt, will win his way through by clinging to the sunnier side of doubt. In 'The Ancient Sage'—one of the most personal poems that Tennyson ever wrote—he gives full expression to this idea.

Thou canst not prove the Nameless, O my son,
Nor canst thou prove the world thou movest in,
Thou canst not prove that thou art body alone,
Nor canst thou prove that thou art spirit alone,
Nor canst thou prove that thou art both in one :
Thou canst not prove that thou art immortal, no
Nor yet that thou art mortal—nay, my son,
Thou canst not prove that I, who speak with thee,
Am not thyself in converse with thyself,
For nothing worthy proving can be proven,
Nor yet disproven : wherefore thou be wise,
Cleave ever to the sunnier side of doubt.

The same thought also lies behind the prologue to 'In Memoriam'—a poem that is even more personal than 'The Ancient Sage.'

We have but faith : we cannot know ;
For knowledge is of things we see ;
And yet we trust it comes from thee.
A beam in darkness : let it grow.

In the second place, Tennyson would have us remember that doubt is not a creation of the Devil, but a gift from God. As a young man at Cambridge, where he wrote his 'Supposed Confessions of a Second-rate Sensitive Mind,' he had been inclined to look upon his doubts as though they were a sin. It seemed terrible that he should be seeking after a sign when the Saviour of the world had given His life-blood for his redemption. He longs for a return to the happy state of childhood when doubts and fears were unknown, and when the terror of the tomb, and what lay beyond, had never been thought of.

Thrice happy state again to be
The trustful infant on the knee !
Who lets his rosy fingers play
About his mother's neck, and knows
Nothing beyond his mother's eyes.

He thinks, too, of his mother's prayers, how she had asked God to heal his doubts and reconcile him to Himself. It seemed strange that such a prayer had never been answered. No one could doubt the purity of his mother's life or the earnestness with which she had prayed. Tennyson feels that his life is 'dark, formless, utterly destroyed.' And then suddenly there bursts upon him the truth that 'It is man's privilege to doubt.' He is different from the ox roaming through 'horned valleys' and under 'fringed hills.' He bears little resemblance to the young lamb skipping from furrow to furrow, answering the call of its mother, but quite incapable of dreaming about the future. Man has within himself a questioning spirit. He looks into the laws of life and death, he sees things that seem and things that be, he analyses his

double nature, and he compares every creed until he has found the right one—if, indeed, there be any true creed at all. Unlike the animals, it is a man's privilege to have doubts. It is true that all men do not live up to this privilege. Some cling to idols. But, for Tennyson, this cannot be. He can only utter a prayer asking that God will shadow him, forgetting his sins and enlightening him with His love.

The same thought occurs with, perhaps, even more emphasis in 'In Memoriam,' where it is clearly shown that doubt is often a prelude to a stronger faith. It was so in the case of Arthur Hallam.

Perplex in faith, but pure in deeds,
At last he beat his music out.
There lives more faith in honest doubt,
Believe me, than in half the creeds.

He fought his doubts and gathered strength,
He would not make his judgement blind,
He faced the spectres of the mind
And laid them : thus he came at length

To find a stronger faith his own.

With this we may compare what Carlyle has written in *Sartor Resartus* : ' A strange contradiction lay in me, and as yet I knew not the solution of it : knew not that spiritual music can only spring from discords set in harmony.'

The third leading principle that guided Tennyson in his search for truth was his emphasis on the necessity of always clinging to the principle of faith, apart from the different forms that faith assumes. The Ancient Sage tells his youthful inquirer that he must learn to distinguish the real from the unreal, the transient from the intransient, the wheat from the chaff. Real faith, he maintains, never falters in the battle of hostile words, is never disturbed by the conflict between positive and negative. Such a conflict only serves to nerve her for the battle. Real faith can always see the best that shines behind the worst. She knows that the sun is only hidden for the night, and that the summer is revealed in the winter bud. The fountain will actually be seen where her

onlookers could only wail 'Mirage.' Speaking of real faith, Tennyson writes :

She reels not in the storm of warring words,
 She brightens at the clash of 'Yes' and 'No,'
 She sees the Best that glimmers thro' the worst ;
 She feels the Sun is hid but for a night,
 She spies the summer thro' the winter bud,
 She tastes the fruit before the blossom falls,
 She hears the lark within the songless egg,
 She finds the fountain where they wailed 'Mirage.'

Tennyson was a firm believer in the principle of change. He abandoned the ideal of rest pictured in 'The Lotus Eaters' for that of change as sketched in 'Ulysses.' He looked upon life here as a 'working out of the beast,' a subduing of the 'ape and tiger,' and he regarded life in the Hereafter as a progression 'from state to state.' He was welcomed by the leading scientists of his day for the enthusiasm with which he adopted the latest scientific discoveries. Men like Herschel, Owen, Sedgwick, and Tyndale looked upon him as the champion of science, and encouraged him in his quest for truth with words that were full of genuine admiration. But, beneath this belief in change, there always lay a great reverence for law and order—a grim determination to hold fast to everything that was real and true. It was necessary that the old order should change and give place to new, but it was equally necessary

to make
 This ever-changing world of circumstance,
 In changing, chime with never-changing law.

This, Tennyson maintains, can only be done by clinging to the faith that lies 'beyond the forms of faith.'

Finally, Tennyson would have us remember that the search for religious truth calls for a spirit of toleration. We must not only realize that some require a fixed form of faith while others can only breathe in an atmosphere that is entirely free, but we must also remember that the religious creeds of the West need to be supplemented by those of the East. Eastern

philosophy had a great fascination for Tennyson, and in his 'Akbar's Dream' he emphasizes the truth that all modes of worship made by man have something of light in them as well as shade. The poem records an imaginary conversation between Akbar, the great Mogul who ruled India from 1565 to 1605, and his intimate friend, Abul Fazl. Akbar was one of the most tolerant of rulers. His chief concern was to secure a religion which would embrace the best beliefs held by all the different religions that were known to him. He refused to condemn any creed, believing that the only thing about which a man may wax intolerant is intolerance.

Shall the rose
Cry to the lotus, 'No flower thou'? the palm
Call to the cypress, 'I alone am fair'?
The mango spurn the melon at his foot?
'Mine is the one fruit Alla made for man.'
Look how the living pulse of Alla beats
Thro' all His world. If every single star
Should shriek its claim 'I only am in heaven'
Why that were such sphere-music as the Greek
Had hardly dream'd of. There is light in all,
And light, with more or less of shade, in all
Man-modes of worship.

Tennyson could not bear the uncharitable spirit that tore sect from sect and Church from Church. Even in the obscure religions of the East, man could find spiritual truth if he was humble enough to look for it.

It is to the credit of Tennyson that he came through the conflict with his colours flying. Unlike his contemporary, Meredith—who, from some standpoints at any rate, was quite as vigorous a thinker as Tennyson—his search for truth did not end in what might be called a combination of cynicism and stoicism. Meredith had little sympathy with the man who tried to solve the deep mysteries of life. He was convinced that such an attempt would always prove fruitless, and to waste one's energy on such a barren quest is to call forth all the poet's scorn and derision. In his poem 'A Faith on Trial' he likens people of this kind to a mole burrowing in

a blind alley. They find things as gaunt and empty as when they look through a telescope at the 'skeleton moon.'

But the Questions, the broods that haunt
Sensation insurgent, may drive,
The way of the channelling mole,
Head in a ground-vault gaunt
As your telescope's skeleton moon.
Barren comfort to these will she dole ;
Dead is her face to their cries.

In Meredith's 'Hymn to Colour' we are told that man thrives, not through spinning obscure questions, but by living a life filled with noble deeds.

Shall man into the mystery of breath
From his quick beating pulse a pathway spy ?
Or learn the secret of the shrouded death,
By lifting up the lid of a white eye ?
Cleave thou thy way with fathering desire
Of fire to reach to fire.

This is one of Meredith's most difficult poems to understand. The main idea seems to be that the mystery of life and death can be discovered only through love. Love in the poem is represented by colour, and it is during life's colour-moments that we obtain our true vision of spiritual realities. It is love, not any process of analysis, which makes us understand that life and death are counterparts of each other in the same way as light and darkness. It is love which opens our eyes to the beauty that may be found in the wonder of a dawn or in the petals of a flower. Above all, it is love which helps us to read the riddle of Earth, and which enables men to climb from their low life to the stature of the gods themselves.

More gardens will they win than any lost ;
The vile plucked out of them, the unlovely slain.
Nor forfeiting the beast with which they are crossed,
To stature of the gods will they attain.
They shall uplift their Earth to meet her Lord.
Themselves the attuning chord !

It is action, not speculation ; love, not mere inquiry, which

helps us to understand life, and which leads us to the highest that life contains.

Tennyson, no doubt, would have agreed with Meredith both in maintaining the inadequacy of mere intellectual inquiry and the necessity of understanding the secret of love if one is to discover the secret of the universe. But, while the only comfort that comes to Meredith is a Spartan doctrine of Earth while he is alive, and a promise of his good influence remaining immortal after he is dead, Tennyson discovers that even on earth all is love though all is law, and that in the Hereafter he will enjoy a personal immortality in which he will see Arthur Hallam face to face.

And all is well, tho' faith and form
Be sundered in the night of fear ;
Well roars the storm to those that hear
A deeper voice across the storm.

LESLIE S. PEAKE.

A History of Manchester College. By V. D. Davis, B.A. (Allen & Unwin. 10s.) The forerunner of Nonconformist Colleges was founded by Richard Frankland, one of the ejected clergy, at Rathmel in the West Riding of Yorkshire. Here in the course of twenty-eight years he trained over three hundred students for law and medicine but the greater part for the ministry. The Warrington Academy was opened in 1757 with Dr. Taylor of Norwich as its Divinity tutor, and in its 26 years trained just over 400 men, most of whom were destined for law, medicine, the army or trade ; 55 at least were divinity students. Then came the Manchester period from 1786 to 1805 ; followed by 87 years at York, 13 more years in Manchester, and 86 in London. In 1889 Manchester College found its final resting-place in Oxford. Mr. Davis is an old student and has been able to draw on reports and minute books which show the course of studies. Biographies of such noted teachers as James Martineau have added to the sketches of tutors and students. Estlin Carpenter has a unique record of service for the College and Dr. Jacks has had an influence on the whole theological world as editor of the *Hibbert Journal*. The volume is a worthy record of a college which has fine traditions and is in full vigour to-day.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES AND THEIR MESSAGE

I HAVE to begin by asking that several things may be taken for granted. The miracles reported of Jesus raise a number of problems—the abstract possibility of miracle as it is commonly understood, the substantial trustworthiness of the gospel records, the difficulty of explaining the healing ministry of Jesus solely, if at all, by the theory of mental therapeutics. Gladly as I would discuss these problems, I must content myself, in view of my immediate purpose, with affirming my assured belief in deeds wrought by Jesus which require for their explanation the possession by Him of supernatural power. Under what conditions was that power exercised, and what was the purpose which called it forth? Those are the questions to which I would offer an answer, having in mind what Dr. D. S. Cairns has said concerning them in that challenging book of his, *The Faith that Rebels*.

Believing, then, that real miracles had a place in Christ's ministry, how are we to account for them? What was there in Him that enabled Him to perform them? It is there that we must find the secret. We have happily escaped from the old apologetic which approached Jesus by way of the miracles, and found in them evidence of the divineness of His person. We travel by another and better road. We come to the miracles *via* Jesus, and it is not the miracles which authenticate Him, but He who authenticates them. We believe in them because we believe in Him. I have never forgotten one golden sentence which I heard George MacDonald once utter. 'If I want,' said he, 'to understand a miracle, I must first of all understand the man who did it.' We turn to Jesus, therefore, and we ask, Wherein lay His wonder-working power? What was the secret of the mighty works which the Gospels ascribe to Him? Here we are confronted with an explanation which, with the inference he draws from it, is the most novel and arresting thing

in Dr. Cairns's book. Put briefly, what he says is that the miracles of Christ were works of power wrought in response to faith, and that the power to do them was due to the reinforcement of Christ's perfect humanity by the Holy Spirit, presumably in answer to Christ's faith; for the inference drawn is that prayer and faith can make similar power accessible to us, and, though Dr. Cairns hesitates to say this in so many words, similar effects possible. His book is, in substance, a plea that 'the victorious energy of faith' shall be made to confront the evil of the world, that being the way to its conquest. 'The roots of His' (i.e. Christ's) 'unique power over nature,' says he, 'lie in His unique spiritual character, not in His metaphysical divinity, but in His perfect humanity.' 'The Gospel theory of the "miracles" of Jesus is that they are the answers of God to the prayers of the ideal Son . . . and they say with unambiguous plainness that that ideal Man invited His disciples to similar enterprises of faith, encouraging them to believe that in proportion to their faith would be the manifestation of God's order, the revelation of man's life as God meant it to be.' Now let it be readily admitted that there are certain things in the Gospels which, taken at their face value, seem to sustain Dr. Cairns's positions. There is, e.g., the importance attached by Jesus to faith. Nothing delighted Him more than faith in those who appealed to Him. We recall His eulogy of the Gentile centurion, and His joyful surrender to the persistent pleading of the Syro-Phoenician woman, 'O woman, great is thy faith; be it done unto thee even as thou wilt.' 'Believe ye,' said Jesus to the two blind men, 'that I am able to do this?' And when they answered, 'Yea, Lord,' His immediate response was, 'According to your faith be it done unto you.' 'All things,' said Jesus on another and memorable occasion, 'are possible to him that believeth.' Thus was expressed the value of faith on the part of those for whom healing was sought from Christ or of their friends or the folk about them. It seemed as though

Christ's healing power could function most easily in an atmosphere of faith, whereas one of unbelief, as at Nazareth, restricted its operation. All this presents no difficulty. It has its parallel in the reinforcement which, as I believe, a patient facing a serious illness, or undergoing a dangerous operation, can bring to the skill and resource of the doctor, that reinforcement consisting of a mind confident as to the issue. That temper of mind—faith, if so you care to term it—may be inspired by the doctor, or it may spring from a sure trust in the loving care of God, this attitude being due to the patient's own prayers or the intercessions of others. That is where in the curative process the minister can reinforce the doctor.

But in the Gospels faith is also in certain contexts declared by Christ to be, so far as the miracle-worker is concerned, the explanation of his power. 'Why could we not cast him out?' asked the disciples when convicted of failure to cure the epileptic child. 'Because of your littleness of faith,' said Jesus. And He proceeded to tell them, with a touch of Oriental hyperbole, of the mountains that a faith comparable to a grain of mustard-seed would be able to remove. 'Nothing,' He said, 'shall be impossible unto you.' Now there is abiding truth behind those words of Jesus, a glorious truth, if only we understand them aright. But what, leaving that for the moment, I would observe is that Jesus does not speak of faith when He is explaining His own miracle-working power. He ascribes it to the Spirit of God. 'If I by the Spirit of God cast out demons,' said He. Luke's alternative expression, 'by the finger of God,' in the parallel passage has the same meaning. Now what is the reality of experience and action which lies behind that language? We, in interpreting our experience, think of the Holy Spirit as an Other than ourselves entering into us, quickening all our powers, and lifting us to heights of achievement that to us, left to ourselves, would be impossible. But was it like this with Jesus? Dr. Cairns seems to

think so, the only difference he allows between the Master and the disciples being that Christ's works, though wrought in the same way, are credibly likely to surpass those of His followers. But what about the divine quality of being which, according to our evangelical faith, inhered in Christ, marking Him off from us? What function had that in His works of power? I cannot recall any treatment of our Lord's person in which the relation of what is called 'the Spirit of God' to Christ is intelligibly explained and justified. We, to be our best selves, need the Spirit. In what sense did Christ receive Him too? If I may hazard—quite tentatively—some interpretation of the fact of experience of which Jesus was conscious, I would offer the following. We must avoid thinking of the relation of Jesus to the Father as parallel to that of our personalities to God. No; there is a fundamental difference. We are capable of receiving into our personality the inflow of the divine. That to us is a fact of experience. With Jesus it was a fact of His very being. For He belonged by nature to that plane of personality to which we as yet only partially approach—a plane where the separateness which marks our personality as imperfect does not exist. For, while in the Being of God, as I conceive it, there are as two centres of thought and feeling the Father and the Son, from that centre of consciousness and will which we call the Father there is an inflow of all that God is into that other centre—also divine—which we call the Son, and from that centre there is a return-movement to the Father. The Father is in the Son, and the Son in the Father. Looked at from beneath, there are, as we say, two Persons—two gathered up into the unity of perfect personality; metaphysically two, but ethically one; and the ethical is the ultimate ground and content of the metaphysical. Now, if that is how we may conceive the relation of Father and Son in the Godhead, what change was made therein by the Incarnation? Surely if, then, the Son, assuming a real humanity, began to act

as the centre of the personal life of the man Jesus, the very fact that Jesus began as a babe, and grew through childhood and youth up to manhood, implied some diminution in what the Son at His centre received or gave. There was still and always the outflow from the Father; there was a growing reception and response on the part of the Son. Part of the human development of Jesus consisted in His coming gradually to realize what He was to God and God was to Him. That realization, however dimly conjectured before, became a luminous consciousness at the Baptism. He felt new powers stirring within Him. The inflow had reached a higher level—one which marked it off as unmistakably divine. As from God Jesus could speak of that new energy as 'the Spirit of God,' but from another point of view it was just Christ Himself, or the divine in Him coming to self-realization, and expressing thenceforth in act powers which were His own in virtue of His essential being.

While, therefore, I believe that Christ *quid* incarnate always maintained, as one of the necessities of His true humanity, an attitude of trustful dependence upon the Father, I hold that His consciousness of supernatural power had its roots in other than His mere manhood. That explanation held good of the disciples, so that when they had such power, it was a gift. But it was native to Christ. In one sense it came from God, and it was always used as the will of God permitted and prompted, so that Christ could say: 'The Father in me doeth the works'; in another sense it was simply Christ putting forth power which was His in virtue of what He was. It is these facts of experience which Christ's reference to casting out demons by the Spirit of God must be taken to signify. With the apostles, however, such power as they had to work miracles was an endowment. It was a gift from Christ as part of their equipment for their work, or, as Paul says of 'miracles' (*beneficium*) and 'gifts of healing,' it was among the

χαρίσματα of the Spirit. Confidence that this power was at their disposal, i.e. that God was behind them, and a clear conviction as to what it could enable them to do, i.e. faith in this double sense, were an important factor in their effectual use of it. But the power itself was not their own; it was a gift from Christ or the Spirit, and the apostles recognize this in their use of it. When they essay a miracle, it is in the name of Christ. 'Aeneas,' says Peter, 'Jesus Christ healeth thee.' Before turning to the body of Tabitha, he kneels down and prays. The prescription which James gives for sickness is that the elders are to pray, and anoint the patient 'in the name of the Lord.' 'Lord,' said the Seventy when they returned from their evangelistic tour, 'even the demons are subject unto us in Thy name.' It was, therefore, a derived and delegated power which the followers of Christ confess themselves in the New Testament as possessing.

But if they possessed it, why should not we? That, though not put expressly in so many words, seems to be Dr. Cairns's challenge. He thinks it is our faith that is at fault. In one section of his book he traces the story of 'miracles' in the Christian Church. He refuses to allow that they ceased with the formation of our New Testament. He cites Harnack as saying that the method of treating disease enjoined by James, viz., anointing and prayer, persisted well on into the third century, and that the displacing of this method by medical treatment was due to the influence of Greek culture on Christian thought and practice. We know too little of these alleged miracles to judge them as we could wish, but as, according to Harnack, many of the reported cures were those of supposed possession by demons, it looks as though mental suggestion would explain most, if not all, of them. In that case there is no need to import the notion of miracle. Roman Catholicism, of course, holds that miracles have never ceased, and in proof cites numberless traditions associated with its

saints and holy places. But these stories, again, in so far as they are true, would probably admit of a non-supernatural explanation. The judgement to which I myself incline is that miracles in the true sense of the word ceased with the apostles or their immediate successors. I think this because by that time the message of the miracles had found adequate expression. For, rightly regarded, they are part of the gospel. As Dr. Cairns wisely argues, they were not evidential wonders, signs attached to our Lord's teaching to authenticate it; they are part of the teaching. They declare in act what Christ understood by the coming of His Kingdom. What Christ challenged in all His supernatural action were various forms of what we call evil. Bodily sickness was one of its commonest forms. His attitude towards this was, as Dr. Cairns aptly says, just that which every true doctor assumes; He was out to fight it as something that ought not to be. He feels the same about those abnormal conditions of mind or body which the thought of the time attributed to demonic possession. How far Jesus shared that explanation of them it is difficult to say. He speaks sometimes *as if* He shared it. He even attributed curvature of the spine in one instance to the action of Satan. Whether in His use of it such language was literal or metaphorical, what we can indubitably deduce from it is that in Christ's judgement these things were evil—wrong conditions that were to have no place in the ideal order purposed by God. Hence He attacks them, and He even cites His cure of the demonized as evidence that the Kingdom had already arrived and was expressing itself. Christ was out against evil in all its forms—physical as well as moral evil—so that later on a New Testament writer was able to speak of Him as 'manifested that He might destroy the works of the Devil.' So it was more than sin that Christ was challenging, though, if sin could be eliminated, much of the world's suffering would disappear too. We may even go further. Along this line of interpretation I can

see a message also in the nature-miracles—a message so true to the gospel fully understood that it flings an authenticating light upon the deeds themselves. Does not the feeding of the multitude declare that Christ is against hunger? Does it not signify as the mind of Christ that in a world where man and conditions are ordered as they should be no one should lack bread? Is not the stilling of the tempest a parabolic act pointing to a time when man shall have come so to use and master Nature that she shall cease to affright or injure him? Man suffers from heedlessness and ignorance as well as from wrongdoing. And what of death? Does Christ's raising of the dead mean that death is to pass out of human experience? So some have thought, for in that wonderful dream of the future—a future belonging, be it understood, to this world—which John gives us in the Apocalypse under the figure of the New Jerusalem coming down out of heaven from God, he says, not only that pain has ceased and that crying and tears are ended, but also that death is no more. Can we ever justly expect that, the human body being organized as it is? Science would say, 'No,' nor need we resent that answer. When death comes to a man in the ripeness of his years and usefulness, we can say, 'Nothing is here for tears.' The tragedy of death is when it smites the young and the middle-aged, cuts off the child in life's morning, arrests some career of shining promise, robs the world of one who still had much to do and to give. When this happens, we feel there is something wrong somewhere; we resent it; we feel the pity and the pathos of it. And does not Christ stand with us there? To me it is significant that those whom He is said to have brought back to life were all young—a little girl in one case; a young man who was a widow's only son in another. Even Lazarus, if we accept him as a further instance, was probably only about our Lord's own age. By undoing in these instances what death had done, Christ may not unreasonably be taken as protesting against the

tragedy of premature death, and as declaring that in a world fully informed, and with conditions and human action ordered as they should be, such tragedies would cease.

The miracles of Jesus, then, as I understand them, are part of the gospel message. They are intended to illustrate His idea of the Kingdom, to declare God's purpose for the world. Dr. Cairns is quite right in repudiating the evidential explanation of their meaning. They are, as he claims, not seals attached to the document; they are part of the document itself. As mere 'signs' Jesus steadfastly refused to work them. Indirectly, of course, they authenticated the message, and attested the quality of Him who wrought them. But that was, by the way. Directly and primarily they were works of power prompted by pity, and they were intended to exhibit the Kingdom of God at work, to illustrate by act its scope and purpose. They are Christ's acted protest against what we call the evil of the world. His gospel antagonizes, not merely sin, but suffering. It would have been significant and valuable if Christ had just declared this in word, but to utter it in act, apart from being more dramatic and arresting, was to put the message beyond question, even as no prophetic word concerning the redeeming love of God could have got home with the convincing finality which belongs to the Incarnation and the Cross. In revelation, as in other realms, acts always speak louder than words. The miracles, too, point one further lesson. Whether wrought by Christ Himself or by His early disciples through the power which He delegated to them, they declare that God is in the warfare against evil. He is not, as some have thought, 'above the battle.' He is more than an interested spectator of the fight; He is an active participant in it. Yes, but how? There Dr. Cairns seems at certain points in his book to hint more than he definitely declares. He seems to cast longing eyes back at miracle. He is reluctant to confine it to that first age when the gospel was in process of expression. He seems to descry

miracles in the post-apostolic age. He cites with approval Luther's saying that, if we had faith enough, there is no disease that we could not cure. His theory, too, that Christ's miracles were due to His perfect humanity empowered by faith is similar in its implication. The truth is that Dr. Cairns seems to confuse at times two different conceptions of faith. When he claims that Christianity is a 'faith that rebels,' in the sense that it refuses to acquiesce in the disorders and evils of the world, but challenges them in the name of God, and declares that they must cease to be, he is on unassailable ground ; he is simply saying what Jesus did. Too often, as he reminds us, the Church has not understood Jesus fully, or has failed to act on His teaching, so that evils have been tamely acquiesced in as if they were of divine ordering, and our only religious duty was to bear them patiently and gain spiritual profit from them. No wonder more impatient spirits outside the Church have scornfully dismissed religion as 'dope.' The Church has not been without blame for their attitude. The Church, if only it rightly understands its Lord and truly obeys Him, is out to mend some things and to end others. To end war, e.g., for, as Dr. Cairns declares : 'To Him who healed the sick it cannot be a matter of divine decree that men should maim and torture each other ; to Him who raised the son of the widow of Nain and gave the youth back to his mother, and wept by the grave of Lazarus for human sorrow ere He revealed "the glory of God" by restoring him to the home of Bethany, it cannot be a matter of absolute divine decree that ten millions of the youth of Europe should be lying in early graves, and that for so many homes the lights have gone out.' Along that line of thought Dr. Cairns carries us all the way. The gospel, in face of the evils of the world, is indeed a rebellious faith ; it stands committed by Jesus to attack and destroy them. But the term 'faith,' whilst thus describing a belief, a conviction, a conception of truth, is used also, as we have seen, in the context of

miracle for a certain attitude to God, a trustful confidence in the power of God. That is not 'a faith that rebels'; it is rather a faith which co-operates, or, better still, a faith which means confidence in God's co-operation with us in our fight against evil. Christ's miracles guarantee that; they are part of His revelation of God. As Dr. Cairns says, 'They show us that we are to think of the Divine Love in the simplest way as delighting in the dispelling of pain, the restoring of sanity, the satisfying of hunger, the preservation of life, the dispelling of premature death, just the things which ordinary human love glories in being able to do.' We believe all that, though it would do every one of us good to believe it much more intensely. What we hesitate to believe is that the divine reinforcement which Jesus guarantees should issue for us in the working of miracle. There was justification for that issue, as we have seen, when the revelation was in process of utterance. But, when once the message had been adequately given, miracle as a vivid and convincing mode of uttering it was no longer fitting or necessary. Indeed, its continuance would have been a barrier to human progress. It would have discouraged man's own effort to ameliorate distressing conditions, all that process of patient investigation, prompted by sympathy as much as by curiosity, by which man, in arming himself for the fight against evil, has found and won himself, as well as learnt how to co-operate with God. That education was too valuable to be missed. The process is scarcely less valuable than the end towards which, under the guiding Providence of God, it is intended to lead. It is true that 'we see not yet all things put under' man. His battle with the evils of the world is simply in progress, and the end is not yet. But we see Jesus, and we behold in Him the pledge of what that end shall be. He assures us that God wills the fight, and that He shares it with us. That to me is the abiding message of the miracles of Jesus.

A. LEWIS HUMPHRIES.

JOSEPHUS AND GOSPEL HISTORY

JOSEPHUS has always been a figure of commanding interest, although curiously diverse estimates of his personal qualities have been formed. From the earliest days of Christianity his works have been popular with Christian readers. Luke may have used him as an authority for his *Acts of the Apostles*. He was quoted in 180 by the Jewish Christian writer Hegesippus, and later by Origen. He was translated into Latin, Hebrew, Syriac, Arabic, Armenian, and other languages. The *editio princeps* of his printed works in Latin was issued in Augsburg in 1470, and the Calvinist, Sebastian Chateillon, Professor of Theology at Basle, included the sixth book of the *Jewish War* in his Latin edition of the Bible. Before the sixth century this same book, in Syriac, had been incorporated in the canons of the Syrian and Armenian Churches. Even in the seventeenth century he was held by some theologians to be divinely inspired. The English translation by William Whiston was published in 1786, twenty-six years after he had lost his Cambridge chair for his Unitarian views. It established itself by the side of the Bible and *Pilgrim's Progress* in pious households of Great Britain for Sunday reading. Commenting on this literary history, Dr. R. Eisler remarks : ' It may well be said that few works outside the Bible have exercised such a powerful and far-reaching influence as the writings of this wretched renegade.' Once more he appears in the limelight ; for the old controversy as to his attitude to Christianity and the value of his testimonies to the facts of its history has been renewed by the discovery of the Slavonic version of his works. His latest translator, Dr. H. St. J. Thackeray, included in an appendix to the third volume of his Loeb translation of his works the Slavonic passages which vary from, or are additional to, the standard text. These had been brought to his notice by Eisler, whose German

work has now become available for English readers in the edition produced by Dr. A. H. Krappe under the title *The Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist according to Flavius Josephus*.

Josephus was born in 37-8, and died at the close of the first century. His career, therefore, covered a period of surpassing interest and importance in Christian history, and his writings are, among non-Christian sources, the most valuable we possess. He was a Jew of aristocratic birth, a priest, a rabbi, a Pharisee, a military commander, and a writer. To these qualifications when he was still a young man we have authority for adding another. After the capture of Jotopata by the Romans, where Josephus escaped with his life by virtue of his own wits and good fortune, he was brought before Vespasian as a prisoner in irons. Vespasian, who had heard beforehand that Josephus was accounted as a prophet, was much impressed when the prisoner predicted his accession as Emperor, and thereafter treated him with marked favour. One of the striking Slavonic variations in the story of the capture of Jerusalem relates to the ambiguous oracle on which the Jews relied, to the effect that one from their country would at that time become the ruler of the inhabited world. This was supposed to be Vespasian, who was proclaimed emperor on Jewish soil. But in the Slavonic version we read: 'Some understood that Herod [was meant], others again that crucified Wonder-worker Jesus, others lastly Vespasian.' If these words are to be regarded as a genuine utterance of Josephus, they are an eloquent witness of the widespread impression that the war between the Jews and the Romans was a critical event in the world's history. Rome feared the East. The Jews, with their passionate yearning for political independence born of messianic ideas which were the life-blood of their faith, might have succeeded but for internal dissensions, and their defective military organization. But there was no successor to Judas Maccabaeus, and the capture of Jerusalem

gave Rome a further lease of her hold on the Orient. It is this stupendous background that makes the *Jewish War* so thrilling to readers of Josephus, who is writing out of his personal experiences and basing his account of the course of events on sound and trustworthy authorities. Naturally his patriotism was widely doubted by his fellow Jews, but, though he stood on the side of the Romans and became the trusted adviser of the Flavian emperors, he was proud of his Jewish lineage, and expounded the faith of his race with eloquence and conviction to the Gentile world. His position gave him access to the imperial archives, to *acta* and decrees which he has translated into polished Greek from the original Latin. His relations with Domitian were less happy; for Domitian for a time was bitterly antagonistic towards Jews and Christians alike. His hostility, however, ceased, and Josephus appears to have spent his later days in comparative comfort. He wrote the *Contra Apionem*—an admirable defence of the Jewish faith—and an autobiography, wherein he sought to rebut the accusations of Justus of Tiberias, who took part in the Galilæan campaign of 66 and charged Josephus with instigating the revolt of Tiberias from Rome. His largest and most elaborate work, the *Jewish Antiquities*, in twenty books, which in certain passages overlaps the *Jewish War*, is the product of his later years.

Any one who reads Josephus for the first time in the original experiences a delightful surprise. His Greek style is smooth and flowing, suggesting that it is modelled on Attic rather than Hellenistic examples, such as the Septuagint, which was familiar to him. There is a remarkable freedom from the Semitisms which are a marked feature of the *Koine* of the first-century writers of the New Testament, and Thackeray notes that he abjures the vulgarisms of later Alexandrian Greek which were not disdained even by Polybius. The purity of his diction is explained by the fact that his own Greek was revised and polished by assistants whom he employed for this purpose—hack-writers of ordinary

type, but also others more gifted, who echo the manner of Thucydides and Sophocles.¹ Most critics regard the *Jewish War* as his best work ; it is not only trustworthy as history, but as a literary achievement is of a high order and its merits as an artistic whole are generally recognized. But as its first book has a full account of Herod the Great and the events which succeeded his reign, it has always seemed strange to Christian readers that not a single reference to the Christian movement occurs in the work. It is otherwise with the *Jewish Antiquities*, published twenty years later. This contains three allusions ; the first to the murder of John the Baptist, who is described as ' a good man ' who baptized the Jews ' for the purification of the body when the soul had been thoroughly cleansed by righteousness,' and to whom men flocked, ' for they were highly elated at listening to his words ' ; the second to the death of ' the brother of Jesus who was called Christ (James was his name), who was delivered up with certain others to be stoned to death for transgressing the law, sentenced thereto by Ananus the high priest and the Sanhedrin.' The authenticity of these two passages has never been seriously doubted. Not so the third, known as the *Testimonium Flavianum*, which has been, and perhaps always will be, a battle-ground of controversy. Whiston on the strength of it believed Josephus to be an Ebionite Christian, while Laqueur, to whose researches all scholars are indebted, thinks that Josephus, realizing the growing popularity of the Christian religion, inserted the paragraph as a gesture of friendliness and also to ensure the preservation of his works. This is not an impossible theory ; the deaths of the consul Flavius Clemens and his wife Domatilla on the charge of ' atheism ' impressively witnessed to the growing vogue of the faith in the higher ranges of society. From the days of Eusebius, who quotes it in full, the passage has been regarded as the authentic and not unfriendly

¹ See Thackeray, *Josephus, The Man and the Historian* (New York, 1929), pp. 109-18.

verdict of an outsider on Jesus and His work. But during the sixteenth century the opinion of the learned turned against its genuineness, and it was held to be the interpolation of a Christian copyist, who fabricated the paragraph in the interest of the Church. In modern times, Schürer, Norden, and the majority of critics have held this view. But readers of Niese's article in the *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* will recall the fact that, as against his conviction of the spuriousness of the passage, Dr. L. H. Gray introduced a note in which he records that after Niese's death Burkitt, Harnack, and W. E. Barnes maintained the improbability of the theory of a Christian interpolation, and accepted the passage as a genuine utterance of Josephus. More recently, Thackeray abandoned his belief that the whole was a Christian interpolation, and, converted by Eisler's arguments, regarded the statement as a Josephan nucleus; 'the censor's hand has been at work, and we are left with the relics of what was once a fuller and more antagonistic paragraph.' What has hitherto been regarded as an interpolation is now held by Eisler to be a palimpsest; and consequently he has attempted a reconstruction of the passage so as to present it in the form in which it was penned by Josephus. Here is the passage as given in Thackeray's translation, which has been used in the above quotations. Gaps have been left in the places where Eisler has made additions or variations in the extant standard text; these are inserted in the footnotes, so that the reader can judge of the effect of the new recension. 'Now about the time arises' . . . Jesus, a wise man,' if indeed he should be called a man' . . . for he was a doer of 'marvellous deeds, a teacher of men who receive the truth with pleasure, and he

¹ An occasion for new disturbances.

² A wizard of a man.

³ (Who was the most monstrous of all men, whom his disciples call a son of God.)

⁴ Astonishing tricks to such men as accept the abnormal with delight.

won over to himself many Jews and many of the Greek nation.' . . . He was the Christ. And when on the indictment of the principal men among us, Pilate had sentenced him to the cross those who had loved him at the first did not cease.' . . . For he appeared to them on the third day alive again, the divine prophets having [fore]told these and ten thousand other wonderful things concerning him. And even now the tribe of Christians, named after him, is not extinct.' This reconstruction of the text has been adversely criticized, but it also has been regarded as plausible by competent scholars ; all that Eisler claims for it is that 'it may be right.' Most people feel that the tone of the statement in the standard text is somewhat frigid and patronizing, but Eisler's version makes it definitely contemptuous and hostile, thereby of course rendering the theory of a Christian censorship highly probable. On the whole, critical opinion inclines to the abandonment of the theory of fabrication, and either accepts the passage as it stands as the authentic work of Josephus or holds it to be but the nucleus of what he originally wrote. There is much to be said for the argument from the Greek style which converted Thackeray to the latter view. Something seems to have gone wrong with the very first sentence ; the verb Josephus uses means either 'is born' or 'occurs' ; but it is incredible that he should date the birth of Christ about the time of Pilate or use the word 'occur' of anything but an event, which is his invariable practice ; hence it looks as if some word like 'disturbance' or Eisler's phrase 'an occasion for new disturbances' has been deleted. We cannot further dwell on this intriguing problem, but simply state that we have ample evidence for the Christian censorship of anti-Christian works. Under the persecution of Diocletian, all Christian MSS. and writings were condemned to be burned : but it is inferred that Constantine adopted a counterstroke from the fact that Theodosius and Valentinian

¹ and was regarded by them as the Messiah.

² to rave.

ordered the works of Porphyry and all other writings hostile to Christianity to be burned. It follows that Christian censors had power to expurgate books with anti-Christian tendencies and opinions from the fourth century onwards. We have also evidence that Jewish censors deleted passages like the *Testimonium* from the *Josippon*, the Hebrew translation of the works of Josephus, which exists in seven MSS. There are some remarkable reproductions in Eisler showing how Jewish writings about Christ were expurgated by the censor. The silence of Josephus about Christianity in the *Jewish War*, according to Eisler, is not due to personal motives, because he mentions the risings of Theudas and Judas of Galilee, but to the censorship of ecclesiastical authority. This is a vital element in the theories advanced with such a wealth of learning and research in his monumental work, which covers over six hundred pages in the English edition, and reveals an investigation of all the available authorities in papyri, MSS., and printed works, and a mastery of archaeological and other lore and of several languages. He endeavours to find traces of the fund of historical tradition about Jesus in Jewish and pagan sources, which has largely vanished, as he believes, under the system of rigid censorship officially at work from the reign of the first Christian emperor, Constantine. He thinks that enough has survived this process of obliteration in out-of-the-way corners of Christian, Jewish, and heretical literature to throw light upon the personality and mission of Jesus, particularly as they appeared to His enemies. Among these sources, special interest attaches to the recently discovered Slavonic additions to the text of Josephus mentioned above.

Any one who takes the trouble to read the Slavonic additions to the standard text of the *Jewish War* is bound to ask the questions: What is their origin and what their value? particularly when he becomes aware that no MS. containing them is earlier than the sixteenth century. They are to

be found in sixteen MSS. written in Old Russian. To Alexander Berendts belongs the credit of being the first to transcribe and translate these Slavonic texts, and to compare them with the Greek text; a work which his colleague, Konrad Grass, completed by translating the first four books of the Slavonic Josephus into German. The title of the Slavonic texts is not the *Jewish War*, but *On the Capture* (Greek, *Halôsis*) of *Jerusalem*. Two initial prejudices have to be overcome in estimating the value of these MSS., the lateness of their authority and the possibility of the insertion of spurious material. Now Josephus himself informs his readers, in his preface to the *Jewish War*, that he has translated into Greek the account he had previously composed in his vernacular tongue (that is, Aramaic), adding that he had in view his countrymen in the Orient, Arabia, and Mesopotamia. It is clear that the Slavonic translator used a poor Greek text based on the type of MSS. which Niese describes as 'inferior,' and possibly produced by a Byzantine scholar. It may, however, truthfully represent the Aramaic original of Josephus's first draft of the *War*. Eisler believes that the Slavonic translation owes its origin to a Judaizing heresy—that is to a propaganda conducted in the fifteenth century in Russia with the idea of bringing back Christianity to a Unitarian basis. With this movement a parallel has been traced in the Sect of the Josephinists, which sprang up in Northern Italy and Provence in the thirteenth century. A belief that Jesus was 'a son of God'—that is, one of God's angels in the Old Testament sense—is a Paulician heresy which the Slavonic text of Josephus refutes; consequently the Josephinists were probably an offshoot of the Paulicians, a special sect which had adopted the writings of Josephus into their canon and had come into prominence in Italy and in Lithuania, where in the thirteenth century the Slavonic Josephus was translated. The Slavonic Josephus, then, is an unexpurgated text of the *Jewish War* as it existed before the Greek Church in the eleventh century 'ordered a radical

revision of Josephus as a check upon the heretics . . . and denounced all MSS. containing the older and genuine version as spurious,' the passages about John the Baptist and Jesus being deleted and a text of the *Jewish War* being produced in the standard form familiar to us. But it is also possible that the text of the Slavonic version has been subjected to interpolations by Christian hands, or even by Jewish editors. After a thorough scrutiny, Eisler is convinced that with some minor exceptions we may take it to be a faithful translation of the lost Greek original of the *Halosis*. Even if the passages in the Slavonic text concerned with John the Baptist and Jesus show traces of interpolations and deletions by Christian or Jewish editors, yet as they have come down to us they are not to be rejected wholesale on the ground that they do not correspond with the standard Greek text of the *War*. For our part, we are prepared to accept them as the kind of verdict on Christianity which we might expect from Josephus, even if he draws upon the official commentaries of Tiberius and the official reports of Pilate as his authorities. But the real point is, what is their value as history? What are the salient features of the new evidence?

John the Baptist is not named, but is described as a wild man, who summons the Jews to freedom, saying, 'There shall be no mortal ruling over you, but only the Highest who has sent me.' He dipped them in the Jordan and sent them away, repeating the promise of a supreme king, subject to no one. Some mocked; others believed. Brought before Archelaus and the doctors of the Law, he said, 'I am a man, and hither the Spirit of God hath called me, and I live on cane and roots and fruits of the tree.' Threatened with torture, he was unmoved, and urged them to desist from evil works. Simon the Essene rose in wrath and rushed upon him; but, still unmoved, he reproached them, saying, 'I will not disclose to you the secret that is among you because ye desired it not.' . . . And he went to the other side of the Jordan

and continued his work unhindered. In another passage he explains a dream of Herod Philip concerning an eagle that plucked out both his eyes, interpreting it as a coming punishment for the king's rapacity, and Philip dies that night. He condemns Antipas for his marriage with Herodias and Herod orders him to be slain. His nature was marvellous and his ways not human, and even as a fleshless spirit, so lived he, 'drinking no wine, abhorring animal food, and eating only the fruits of the trees.' Reading behind the Christian interpolations, and collating these statements with others, such as the passage in the *Antiquities* already quoted, and with the New Testament, Eisler regards him as the leader of a band of Rechabites and the leader of a revolutionary movement, initiating his followers by a lustration rite, a kind of *sacramentum*, or vow of loyalty, and as finally put to death by Herod Antipas in 36—a date contradicting the generally accepted chronology.

The passage about Jesus opens with the statement that His nature was human but His appearance more than that of a man. Reference is made to His miracles; but, though it is impossible to call Him a man, 'I will not call Him an angel.' He disobeyed the Law and kept not the Sabbath; but He did nothing shameful. He sojourned on the Mount of Olives, where He healed the people and was attended by many who believed He would free them from the Romans. When called upon to enter the city and cut down the Roman troops, 'He disdained us not.' On hearing of this rising, the high priest and the Jewish leaders, in order to clear themselves and save their children, sent word to Pilate. A massacre followed: many were slain, and 'that Wonder-worker' was brought before Pilate, who let Him go. The popularity of Jesus increasing, the scribes bribed Pilate with thirty talents, and he gave them permission to execute their will, and they took Him and 'crucified Him, contrary to the law of their fathers.'

Such in bare outline are these remarkable passages. There

are some obvious interpolations. If Josephus was writing for his co-religionists, he would never have stated that the Jews crucified Jesus or that Pilate only consented to the death of Jesus on receiving an immense bribe. But Eisler is convinced that the crucifixion was the climax of a revolutionary rising of which the leaders were the two robbers crucified by the side of Jesus. He works over all the evidence, including, of course, that afforded by the four Gospels. Always interesting, he offers interpretations of the acts and sayings of Jesus which provoke uncompromising dissent, as, e.g., his view that 'Render unto Caesar' really means 'Throw Caesar's [i.e. Satan's] money down his throat, so that you may be free to devote yourselves wholly to the service of God.' This is a crucial passage, and can afford no support to the theory that Jesus would consent to a revolt against Rome. There is not a particle of evidence to prove that the aims of Jesus were anything but non-political, and consistently pacific from first to last. Paul, who is an earlier witness than Mark, became a Christian, not because the Cross was the tragic ending of an anti-Roman rising, but because it was the triumph of love over hate, and therefore a saving power leading up to his moral regeneration. His teaching, too, as in Rom. xiii., is inconceivable on any other assumption.

The literary problem raised by these Slavonic texts is one of immense complexity. Eisler builds up his theory with admirable ingenuity and amazing fullness of detail, but in the end we feel it rests on a foundation of dubious hypotheses. His re-reading of gospel history was held to be a 'bomb-shell,' but it appears to be strangely innocuous. We believe that the unbiased reader will hardly be convinced that the substantial accuracy of the gospel records has been undermined by these discoveries. We are ready to welcome any authentic non-Christian testimony that can throw fresh light on Christian origins. But the simple, unvarnished testimony of Tacitus and Pliny, apathetic or hostile, carries more weight

than records which have suffered from tendentious manipulation. Even if the *Capture of Jerusalem* ante-dates the Synoptic Gospels and contains a substratum of genuine history, how comes it that it is entirely ignored in the standard and final draft of the *Jewish War*? Eisler holds that the *Capture* was written to conciliate the author's fellow Jews, while the *Jewish War* was produced for the Graeco-Roman world. The latter was published about ten years after the Neronian atrocities, and the Christian sect still continued to evoke public interest and inquiry; why should Josephus be silent about a movement which stood self-condemned as the offspring of an anti-imperial revolt? The fact is that the motives of Josephus are matters of perpetual conjecture. When, twenty years later, he produced his *Antiquities*, and gave, as has been suggested, a public reading of that work, it is at least conceivable that he inserted the famous *Testimonium* because of the steadily growing interest in the beginnings and nature of the Christian faith, but we cannot be absolutely sure that in that cold and detached statement we have an authentic historical document composed by Josephus. In fact, we are still left in doubt if a mind like his could penetrate to the deeper significance of the events culminating in the Crucifixion, which the canonical Gospels have treated with such impressive fullness and with a majestic simplicity and directness of statement which carries its own evidence of veracity.

R. MARTIN POPE.

ARCHBISHOP TEMPLE'S CHARGE

UNDER the title of *Thoughts on Some Problems of the Day* the Archbishop of York has published the charge which he delivered in 1981 in the primary visitation of his diocese.¹ It deals mainly with the utterances of the Lambeth Conference of 1980, and he has incorporated with it an address, which he delivered in December 1980 to his diocesan conference on one of the subjects dealt with in the Lambeth Report and Encyclical, 'Our Heritage in the Anglican Communion.' But though intended for Anglican hearers and readers, the book is full of interest and importance for all British Christians, who will find instruction and inspiration in its broad-minded outlook and its spiritual message, the expression of a robust faith and a courageous sanity that recall the stalwart figure of his father, Queen Victoria's last Archbishop of Canterbury.

The archbishop has chosen 'to offer some contribution to the common stock of the Church's thought,' rather than to dwell on the ordinary subjects of a visitation charge. Those who have appreciated his *Christus Veritas* and remember his share in the earlier volume, *Foundations*, written by Canon Streeter and six other Oxford men, will know that this latest contribution to Christian thought will be found honest and helpful: he recognizes that 'the recent dislocation of our traditional habits' has led to a widespread neglect of the ministrations of the Church, but offers the comforting assurance that 'that is only for a time.' And before he discusses the problems of thought which the Church has to face to-day, he makes some practical suggestions for bringing public worship into closer relation with the life of the people. He sees no reason why any should be called

¹ *Thoughts on Some Problems of the Day.* By William Temple. (1981: Macmillan & Co.)

upon to shorten their sleep on the morning of their day of rest for a communion service at 8.0, and suggests matins to *Benedictus* at 8.45, followed by Holy Communion at 9.0 or 9.15, and a sermon (thirty minutes at least) with hymn and short prayers at 11.0. On a later page (161) he calls this longer service an instruction, a sermon of thirty or forty minutes with short prayers. The recommendation is a striking answer to the common and often querulous demand for short sermons; the generally acknowledged ignorance of the New Testament evidently calls for more thorough and continuous exposition of its teaching and revelation of its treasures as well as a revival of private study of the Christian scriptures which might be expected to follow. In summer, the archbishop suggests two evening services, evensong and sermon at 5.0, compline and sermon at 8.30, the same sermon perhaps being used for the two congregations: the winter service he leaves for evensong and sermon at 6.30.

I. FAITH IN GOD. Chapter I deals with Christian faith in God: 'We are concerned, not with speculative opinion, but with revealed reality; nor have we therein a mere disclosure of static truth, but a dynamic force vitalizing those who receive it and making them responsible for its transmission.' It is true, as the Lambeth Encyclical assures us, that in the scientific and philosophic thinking of our time there is provided 'a climate more favourable to faith in God than has existed for generations'; but, though the direct antagonism between science and religion is over, science can never establish the Christian faith. 'The Gospel is no more established because Sir James Jeans finds the universe more like a thought than like a machine, than it is imperilled when Sir Arthur Keith finds no grounds for belief in immortality.' The religion without revelation which men of science can teach us, though 'congruous with Christian theism,' is but a pale glimmer in comparison with the revelation of God in Christ (Heb. i. 3). For the revelation which

has come to us is not a book, but a Person, and that gospel 'is true always and everywhere.' 'It is the proclamation that God, the Ruler of the Universe, is Love. . . . God, the eternal God, is that or is not that. He cannot be that in the first two thousand years of our era, and something else before and after : He cannot be that for Europeans, and something else for Arabians, Indians, or Chinese. . . . Wherever, therefore, the gospel is accepted, the missionary responsibility must be recognized. . . . No one who has no missionary zeal can truly be a Christian.'

The archbishop then deals with psychology, the study of mental processes, which 'will undoubtedly provide the most serious intellectual difficulties for faith in the period upon which we are entering.' Psychology asks only how our beliefs were formed ; we may be predisposed to them by our upbringing, but that does not settle the question of their truth. The psychologist's belief in his theory has also a personal history behind it. If our methods of prayer and worship are represented as means of auto-suggestion, we shall say : 'Of course they are ; and if there exists a God who is our loving Father, what can be wiser or more reasonable than that we should, by methods well tried and proved, bring home to our souls His reality and His love ? If you can teach ways of doing this yet more effectively, tell us of them and we will follow them.' If we are told that our sub-consciousness has created our gospel because it satisfies our needs, truth, not satisfaction, must be our chief concern. And true religious experience, an experiencing of all things in the light of the knowledge of God, is the response to God's objective act in Christ, God's answer from within us to the continuous divine self-utterance in nature, in history, and, above all, in Jesus Christ. The chief danger of the psychological habit of mind is that it withdraws attention from God to fasten it on ourselves. As Father Herbert Kelly has said, 'There used to be a thing called theology ; that is a Greek word which means " thinking about God " ;

it is very old-fashioned now. Now there is a thing called the philosophy of religion ; that means thinking about your own nice feelings ; it is very popular.'

II. THE CHURCH'S WITNESS. The second problem, or series of problems, which we have to face is in the field of human relationships—'Ye shall be my witnesses.'

1. *Peace and War.* When Bishop of Manchester, Dr. Temple was chairman of the Copec Conference in Birmingham, so he has no difficulty in maintaining the resolution of the Lambeth Conference 'that war as a means of settling international disputes is incompatible with the teaching and example of our Lord Jesus Christ.' While fully convinced that it was the duty of Great Britain to declare war in August 1914, he is no less clear that war must be abolished and that public opinion must be trained to support in every way the League of Nations, and to carry out the Pact of Paris in the interest of peace. The work of the League and of the Permanent Court of International Justice at the Hague is to him, 'not a derogation of the sovereign rights of the national State, but the fulfilment of the State's essential principle.' The subordination of all force to the authority of law is the essence of the constitution of the State, and in international questions can only be secured through such an organization as that of the League. And from the standpoint of Christianity the claim of the League is convincing.

2. The *inter-racial* problem is involved with the international, and becomes more pressing with the increasing development of the means of communication. In this connexion the findings of the Jerusalem Missionary Conference anticipate the Lambeth resolutions. Anglo-Saxons are said to be peculiarly liable to the pride of race superiority, and the success of statesmanship in the settlement of difficulties in China, as well as in India and East Africa, for which we are specially responsible, will depend upon an instructed Christian public opinion.

8. Twenty-six pages of the charge are devoted to the consideration of *sexual morality*. The necessity of a chaste life before marriage and self-restraint after it, the obligation of purity and conjugal fidelity applying to both sexes, the dignity and sacredness of the sex-relation involving a spiritual union if physical union is to be justified, are all emphasized before the difficult subjects of divorce and contraception are treated. The archbishop reaffirms the rule of the Church which forbids the ecclesiastical marriage of divorced persons, though he admits that the clergy are required by law to marry in church the innocent who may wish to marry again : in such cases he asks that the bishop be first consulted, and he thinks it would be an advantage if all marriages were legally contracted before a registrar, to be followed by a ceremony in church, where the Church can approve the union. For the use of contraceptives, where there are good moral reasons, he justifies the much-discussed Resolution 15 of the last Lambeth Conference, a resolution carried by the votes of 198 bishops against 67. The disgust often felt for the use of artificial appliances in the intimacies of married life is, he contends, an aesthetic, not a moral, factor : the danger which he recognizes is that they should be used as a cover for illicit sexual intercourse.

III. THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION. The Lambeth Conference of 300 bishops from all parts of the earth brought home to its members the meaning of their professed belief in the Holy Catholic Church, a world-wide spiritual fellowship. The greatness of the Church of England is in its comprehensiveness, as well as in its historical heritage and its fidelity to its divine commission. 'In faith and order we both maintain and proclaim our fellowship with the Catholic Church of all times and places. But we are also in the fullest sense heirs of the great spiritual movement known as the Reformation, with its perpetual stress upon the immediacy of access to God which is in Christ offered to all His children.' Insisting that the Church must hold together

the Catholic, Evangelical, and Liberal elements, the archbishop is clear that the emphasis upon freedom 'accords with the genius of the gospel itself.' He allows himself a welcome touch of humour in referring to the good people who are afraid of the freedom of individual inquiry—'When people invite you to take a safe course they always mean the same thing: that you should select some disaster which is not the worst possible and involve yourself in it. . . . But you can only play for safety by repudiation of the ideal.'

The failure of the Prayer-Book measure led to a hardening of party outlines, but he thinks that the party feeling is now dying away. The Church, however, cannot acquiesce in the situation: it must 'by some means obtain freedom of action in things spiritual.'

IV. REUNION AND VALIDITY. The advance towards union with the Eastern Orthodox and the Old Catholic Churches has been more distinct than with the Free Churches at home. The archbishop is conscious that English Non-conformists were disappointed with the Lambeth decisions of 1930 and thought them retrograde in comparison with those of 1920. Probably too much was read into the 1920 resolutions: there was manifest goodwill and a frank recognition of the action of the Holy Spirit in the work of the Free Churches, but the actual offer of the open pulpit apparently applied only to those Free Church ministers who had declared their willingness to accept reunion. The Lambeth position still rests upon the Quadrilateral, the Scriptures, the creeds, the sacraments, and the historic episcopate: the proposals of 1920 gave no encouragement to intercommunion. The declaration of the Church of England representatives to the Joint Conference of Anglicans and Free Churchmen in July 1928, that the ministries of the non-episcopal Churches 'are real ministries of Christ's word and sacraments in the universal Church,' was qualified by a previous statement that 'we regard them as being *within their several spheres* real ministries in the universal

Church.' Dr. Temple was not a member of that Joint Conference,¹ but he sees nothing in that declaration inconsistent with the Lambeth resolutions of 1920, nor does he think that the bishops in 1930 intended to go back from the language of 1920; in fact, they gave their encouragement to the proposal for a united Church in South India. He thinks it impossible that ministers not episcopally ordained should take part in the administration of Holy Communion in Anglican churches, but he is quite clear that Nonconformists may take the Sacrament there and that no one has a right to refuse any baptized Christians unless they are personally excommunicate. He guards himself against a common misunderstanding of the position of an episcopally ordained clergyman—'If it be held that episcopal ordination confers a *power* of making sacraments, so that when an episcopally ordained priest celebrates the Eucharist something happens in the world of fact which does not happen on any other condition, then these bodies [which have lost the continuity of ministerial succession] have no real sacraments. But that is a theory to which I find myself unable to attach any intelligible meaning. . . . What is conferred in ordination is not the *power* to make sacramental a rite which otherwise would not be such, but *authority* (*potestas*) to administer sacraments which belong to the Church, and which therefore can only be rightly administered by those who hold the Church's commission to do so.'

Rome refuses to recognize this 'continuity of ministerial succession' in the Church of England, and the archbishop admits (p. 130) that this refusal prevents the Anglican ministry from being 'fully representative.'

V. EUCHARISTIC DOCTRINE. The fourth chapter has left the ecclesiastical status of the Church of England somewhat confused by episcopal and sacramental theories;

¹ Since he wrote this, he has been present at the renewed Joint Conference which opened on November 21, 1931.

for, while extreme sacerdotal views of the Sacrament have been disavowed, the refusal of intercommunion has been defended by the contentions that the episcopal system alone maintains the commission of the universal Church, and that sacramental, as distinguished from spiritual, fellowship depends upon 'organic union' with the Church universal. Yet there is no such organic union in existence: East is severed from West, and, in Europe, North from South. The test is unreal, and the argument, though pursued at great length (pp. 101-27), breaks down—'A reunited Christendom must include both the Eastern Orthodox and Rome' (p. 128). Dr. Temple is more helpful when, in his fifth chapter, he turns to theology and discusses the doctrine of the Eucharist.

He sketches the historical background of the Last Supper. Since the scene at Caesarea Philippi we have known that 'the Son of Man must suffer,' and Luke xxii. 16 implies His knowledge that He will not live to eat the Passover. This confirms St. John's statement that the Passover followed the Crucifixion, though an ante-dated Passover may have been allowed on the previous evening if the Passover fell that year on the weekly Sabbath. Christ knows of the plot of Judas and reveals it to John, but will not let him tell Peter and use force to prevent the betrayal. He is 'a victim for sacrifice,' and the all-important words in the institution are 'This is My body which is broken for you'—broken as He broke the bread—'This My blood of the new covenant.' That there was a commemorative purpose in the rite is shown by the words 'This do in remembrance of Me,' preserved by St. Paul (1 Cor. xi. 24, 25), the earliest record, and St. Luke (xxii. 19), though they are not found in St. Mark's account and in its reproduction by St. Matthew (Luke here means Luke in the Codex Bezae and some MSS. of the old Latin version). 'Of course, it is not "a memorial before God" in the sense of calling to His mind what might otherwise not be before it'; 'what is

certain is that at the Eucharist we, being gathered together before God, make remembrance of the sacrifice of Christ by repeating the very act with which He accompanied and interpreted His spiritual offering of it.' Christ has won for us freedom of access to God at all times, but His sacrifice is always the ground for the confidence with which we approach the Father. And he had 'given a sacrificial interpretation of His death by His plainly sacrificial words and acts at the Last Supper.' We repeat His actions that we may enter into their meaning as we offer ourselves a living sacrifice to God. For the essential act in sacrifice was not the killing of the victim, but the pouring of the life-blood upon the altar.

Archbishop Temple adopts (pp. 152, 158) the statement issued in 1930 by a conference of representative theologians on the subject of the Sacramental Presence of Christ in the Eucharist: 'All are agreed that the Presence of Christ in the Eucharist is "after an heavenly and spiritual manner" . . . and all are agreed that our Blessed Lord is always and everywhere present to His faithful people and not through the sacrament of the Eucharist only. . . it should not be thought that any instructed Christian believes in a material Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, whether or not he professes belief in the "Real Presence."' In fact, the bread and the wine are, as they were at the Last Supper, mere symbols; the reality is, as it was then, the offering of Christ's life for us—the blood which is the life (Lev. xvii. 11)—that we may offer ourselves.

It is obvious that there is no justification here for the worship of the reserved elements; though, if their presence helps people to pray, the archbishop does not see why such help should be denied. Nor is there any necessary requirement for fasting communion: 'Archbishop Davidson told Archbishop Temple that he knew it for a fact that Mr. Keble, one of the leaders in the Oxford Anglo-Catholic movement,' paid no observance to any such rule.

The value of this chapter, which should give some much needed instruction to many Anglicans and some Nonconformists, is enhanced by an illuminating letter from Bishop Edwin James Palmer, late Bishop of Bombay. The archbishop accepts it as expressing a view identical in all essentials with his own. The controversies about the Sacrament, Bishop Palmer says, do not worry Indians and will never interest them. To them the world of thought, or the spiritual world, is the only real world; in the symbolic words at the Last Supper they naturally infer that by symbolic action our Lord was preparing for that feeding on Him to take place which He had described in the discourse at Capernaum (John vi.). The Indian 'would be blankly amazed at any and all of these literalisms' which confuse so many English minds.

The archbishop, in the text of his book, has used as an illustration our appreciation of beauty in music or a picture: the colours and figures, the things of the instrument, are the physical accompaniments necessary for the artist to convey his ideas of beauty to our minds; 'the physical events are the indispensable but irrelevant vehicle.' The bishop gives a similar, and perhaps a nearer, parallel in his purchase of a copy of *The Tempest*: the paper and ink are nothing to him, but they are the necessary means by which the action and ideas of the play are conveyed to him. There is really a double symbolism: the printed pages representing the play, and the play itself representing the mind of the poet with which we would have fellowship; the play is not his mind or any part of his personality; 'it is the vehicle or channel by which his mind passes into mine.' So in and through the symbolic words and action at the Last Supper our Lord gives Himself to us to feed upon. This view condemns, not only the gross physical, but also the pathetic quasi-physical, interpretations of the consecrated elements. 'His relation to the bread and wine is not spatial, it is a relation of thought,' not our thought only, as the archbishop

qualifies the words and the bishop agrees, 'God's thought and not only ours.' The symbolic interpretation is incompatible with the vulgar misunderstanding of transubstantiation,¹ but is not inconsistent with the metaphysical distinction between substance (if it be spiritual) and accident (the material elements) by which the mediaeval philosophers justified the transubstantiation dogma. St. Paul wrote, 'Christ our passover is sacrificed for us'; but the form in which he quotes the words about the cup, whether the original form or not, shews at least the sense in which he understood the Lord's words: 'This cup is the new covenant—in my blood.' The early liturgies and the writings of the Fathers show that, in the first four or five centuries, 'it was not regarded as a part of the object of the Eucharist that our Lord should be worshipped as brought near to us in the consecrated elements.'

That Christ is not locally present in the Sacrament was the teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas, quoted by the archbishop (p. 159): '*Corpus Christi non est in hoc sacramento ut in loco.*' And Bishop Palmer emphasizes the terrible danger of idolatry in a country like India, if the idea is suggested 'that the Deity offers Himself for worship in a particular consecrated object.' The Bishop of Birmingham has been often and fiercely attacked by Anglo-Catholics for describing extreme sacramental theories and practices as magic; but in this visitation charge the Archbishop of York uses the same word (p. 110): 'It is admitted that the peril to which strong sacramental doctrine is most liable is that of falling into conceptions properly described as magical.' It is humiliating that these aberrations should beset that service which above all others represents the followship in Christ of all His avowed disciples.

FRANK RICHARDS.

¹ 'Is a change in the significance of a thing a change in that thing?' (p. 154).

MEASURE FOR MEASURE

RABBINIC theology knows, and often repeats, the axiom given in the title of this essay. Its importance and significance are twofold : first of all, in bringing home to the reader the *inner* value of rabbinic religious and ethical thought ; and, secondly, in illuminating the *external* relation between Jewish theology and gospel teaching. As far as the former is concerned, its bearing on current opinion of conceptions about the nature and attributes of God has to be weighed and considered. The origin and development, modification and criticism, of the teaching have to be investigated. Viewing it as a parallel to similar doctrine in the Gospels, such an investigation may enable us to see clearer the interdependence between rabbis and Gospels. Dr. C. G. Montefiore remarks on Matt. vii. 1-5 : ‘ There is nothing in these verses which is not entirely on rabbinic lines. Indeed, the words about “ measure ” and “ meeting ” are much too rabbinic ! I mean that the doctrine of “ measure for measure ” is emphasized too often and too much in the rabbinic literature, and its truth and virtues are lauded too frequently and unreservedly.’¹ Jesus, we are told further, is more original when He attacks ‘ tit for tat ’ than when He accepts and uses it. In another passage² Dr. Montefiore states : ‘ It must, I think, be said that, while the teaching of the parable is not *wholly* without its parallels in the rabbinic literature, the opposite doctrine of measure for measure is more prominent with the rabbis than with Jesus,

¹ *Rabbinic Literature and Gospel Teachings* (London, 1930), p. 145.

² *Ibid.*, p. 286 ; also Matt. xx. 1-16. R. Zera, third century, used exactly the same parable in his funeral oration on the demise of a young scholar, R. Abun b. R. Hiyya (Cant. r. vi. 2 ; Eccl. r. v., pal. Berakoth ii.), who died at the early age of twenty-eight.

and the doctrine represented by the parable is more prominent with Jesus than with the rabbis. Jesus is by no means ignorant of the doctrine of measure for measure. He makes use of it. "According to your works, so shall you be rewarded or punished," is by no means an unknown or unusual teaching. But the balance is better kept by Him than by the rabbis.' It is of small importance in the long run whether the balance is better kept by one or the other, since both systems depend on this wrongly condemned religious principle. It is, further, to be inquired whether the rabbinic aspect is correctly and fairly represented in this comparison. Finally, the background, religious and historical, of the teaching alone can lead to a just estimate of its moral value. A fuller account of the rabbinic teaching may bring us nearer to the truth.

Rabbinic teachers formulated this doctrine in two differently expressed sentences. The first can be translated literally in this way: 'With the measure a man measures, he is measured.' This mostly occurs in Tannaitic sources, i.e. in exegetical and homiletical fragments, the date of which is prior to the end of the second century. About a score of passages of this type could be adduced here, if space would allow it. Since full quotations would be too wearisome for the general reader, the expert may find them in a footnote.¹ Since R. Meir comments upon this adage, one is entitled to date it before the second century, or to consider it as well known in the age of R. Meir and of R. Jose. R. Meir essays to trace this teaching back to Isa. xxvii. 8, seeing in *besasa'ah* the idea of measure for measure. It is, at any rate, most

¹ Siphre Deut., § 308, § 318; Siphre Num., § 106; Mekilta 25a, 38b, 40a, 55a; Gen. r. ix., ed. Theodor, p. 78 (R. Huna in the name of R. Jose ben Halaftha, second century); Exod. r. iii. 12, xxv. 9; Num. r. ix, 24 (R. Meir); Pesikta R. Kahana 82a (in Aramaic by R. Eleazar ben Pedath and R. Joshua ben Levi, third century), Pes. r. xxxix.; Midrash Psalms xxii. 2 and lxxxii. 2; Mishna Sota i. 7; Tosefta Sota iii. 7; b. Sota 8a; pal. Sota 17a; b. Sanh. 100a; Megilla 12b.

interesting that this teacher found it worth his while to justify this theological doctrine by a passage in the Book of Isaiah.

Reviewing these passages, one must see in this teaching a somewhat higher and loftier conception than the elegant 'tit for tat.' First of all, it does not indicate merely that God punishes men or people in exactly the same way as they sinned or transgressed, but also that all the good man does is repaid and refunded in full, not always unto him personally, but many times to his future generations, till the end of all the ages. Secondly, even in this rather crude and coarse form, if we identify it with 'tit for tat,' some teachers modified it by seeing in it some rays of grace and mercy. Man surely could not stand the full measure of judgement. If God would apply the right and exact recompense, no human being could stand the weight of the law. The measure is mitigated on one side, and increased on the other side. If it is a case of virtue and reward, the benefits and advantages outweigh man's merits; if it is a measure of punishment, it falls short of the sinner's desert. The actual measure is, relatively speaking, a trifle compared with the sinner's deed. This becomes clear in reading one of these homilies marked in the footnote. One preacher developed and enlarged R. Meir's teaching in this way. Supposing a man sinned, for which he would be guilty of death by heaven (i.e. for a crime no earthly judge can condemn him to death, for various reasons). His ox dies; his fowl is lost; his bottle is broken; he hurts his finger. Counting them together, they compensate for his sin, and free him from the death-penalty.¹

I turn now to the second phrase, which covers entirely, and corresponds fully to, the title of this essay: 'Measure for measure.' It is even more frequently used and quoted than the former. Here only such passages shall be noted which

¹ v. Eccl. i. vii. 27 and Num. i. ix. 27.

contain this phrase.¹ One cannot fail to notice that the latter phrase is mostly used by teachers and preachers of the Amoraic period, i.e. of the third century and onwards. Why did they change the older expression for the new one? Does this phraseological change also involve an alteration of meaning or not? Was there no reason, only a whim of innovation, for discarding the older term familiar to scholars, and often repeated in the schools of Midrash teachers? Such changes of terms, without variety of attitude towards legal, religious, ethical, or theological problems, as far as I am aware, are most unusual. A closer investigation may bring home to the student of rabbinic sources some of the hidden forces which altered some earlier conceptions and broke the continuity of theological doctrines. It is by no means the only instance of discarding older views, and substituting for them new ideas.

If we return to the first phrase, we may put the question: Does this teaching really agree with our 'tit for tat'? Are we justified in reading this into the rabbis' words? And, if so, was this principle generally recognized by all teachers and thinkers of Jewish religion? Thirdly, how can this be reconciled with the older teaching that God's goodness, mercy, love, and grace is infinitely greater than, and superior to, His measure of punishment or recompense? The key to the right interpretation or understanding of this important, and by no means antiquated, problem is to be found in our first written source of our phrase. In the Wisdom of Solomon, xi. 16, the doctrine is expressed: 'In order that they may recognize that one is punished by the very means by which he sinned.' God, whose all-powerful hand created

¹ Gen. r. ix. p. 78 (R. Simon b. Abba, third century); Exod. r. ix. 10; Num. r. x. 2; Deut. r. xi. 6 (R. Aibo, third century); Lam. r.; ed. Buber, p. 16 (R. Jochanan b. Nappacha, third century); Lam. r. iii. 48 (R. Isaac Nappacha, third century); B. Sanh. 90a (R. Jonathan b. Elieser, third century); B. Ned. 82a; Tanhuma, ed. Buber, iv. 80. There are scores of homilies which apply this rule without mentioning it.

the world out of formless material, could have sent against them crowds of lions or beasts ; moreover, He could have created yet unknown and newly created wild beasts, or such wild animals which breathe fire-spitting elements, or issue from their nostrils poisonous odour, or from their eyes send forth awful sparks of lightning. These dangerous creatures would not merely destroy by biting ; their abominable appearance alone would suffice to bring death and destruction by fear and terror. God, further, could have destroyed them simply by the breath of His anger and fury : yet everything is with Him by measure, number, and weight. The Sapiaientia, well known to St. Paul as well as to the rabbis, adopts here a legal maxim of the old Palestinian school. Traces of the principle as well as of the way of arguing can be detected in the old Tannaitic exegesis. The very term 'measure' used in our sentence signifies the four ways of execution, e.g. by burning, by stoning, by strangulation, or by sword, as applied by the authorities of the law in Palestine. Then the original meaning of the sentence was actually, in letter and spirit, the same as illustrated by the author of the Book of Wisdom. A man who committed a crime or sin, which resembles any of these four methods of execution, the same measure will be meted out to him. A good deal of far-fetched reasoning and arguing was necessary to group all crimes and transgressions guilty of death under these four headings. The legal mind and the homiletical skill of the preachers combined could perform such masterpieces. One instance : Exod. xv. 5 : 'They sank into the bottom as a stone.' This was a punishment for Exod. i. 16, 'And ye see them upon the stones.'

For the argument the following parallels can be adduced. To Gen. vi. 7 : 'What do they think ? I require lions and armies to wipe them off ? Have I not created the world by

¹ v. Marmorstein, *Eine apologetische Mischna*, in *Monatschrift*, vol. lxx. (1926), pp. 876-85.

² v. B. Sotah 8b.

³ Mevk. 89b.

the Logos ? I bring forth a Word, and will destroy them !' Why did God command Noah to make an ark ? is another question. Could He not have saved him otherwise ? Either by lifting him up to heaven, or by His Logos.* Finally, when Israel committed the sin of the golden calf, God was angry, and said : ' What do you imagine—I need swords and spears in order to slay you ? As I created the world with the Logos, thus I can slay you with My Word.'† These parallels, which could be increased, show a close resemblance to the argument used in the Wisdom. In both, the idea of God being the creator is underlined ; the omission of the Logos in an alleged Alexandrinian literary product is rather surprising. Anyhow, the Wisdom, the Gospel writer, and the Tannaite drew from the same source, the legal terminology of the schools and the courts in Palestine.

We saw that R. Meir, a teacher of the second century, essayed to find a biblical source for this conception. Yet his contemporary, R. Judah b. Jlai, flatly contradicted R. Meir's teaching. There are two measures, that of goodness and that of punishment. Which is greater ? Surely the former. This formula is used scores of times in the Midrash. It was repeated in and out of season from the pulpit as well as from the lecturing-desk, in schools and synagogues. Man could not bear the whole amount of goodness ; how could he endure the full measure of his punishment ?‡ There is no such thing as ' measure for measure,' ' tit for tat.' God's justice is moderate, and imposes upon the wicked less than his due, only as much as he can bear,§ but not ' tit for tat.'

There are no means available for fixing chronologically the change of attitude from the older strict measure to the more

* Gen. i. xxviii., ed. Theodor, pp. 26 ff.

† Tanhuna, ed. Buber, Gen., p. 25.

‡ Deut. i. v. 18.

§ B. Sanh. 100a f.

¶ For the terms ' measure of goodness ' and ' punishment,' v. my *The Doctrine of God*, i. pp. 47 ff.

recent higher aspect ; nor can we depict the religious or intellectual background engendering an opposition to the legal concept, and resulting in a reform of theological doctrine. One thing is quite certain : that the Apostle Paul, in his letter to the Romans, ' made use of the very argument so often sounded in the rabbinic schools. ' But not as the *offence*, so also is the *free gift*. For, if through the *offence of one*, *many* be dead, much more the *grace of God*, and the *gift by grace*, which is *by one man*, Jesus Christ, hath abounded *unto many*. And not as it was by *one* that sinned, so is the gift : for the judgement was by *one* to condemnation, but the free gift is of *many* offences unto justification. For, if by *one man's* offence, death reigned by *one*, much more *they* which receive abundance of grace and of gift of righteousness shall reign in life by *one*, Jesus Christ. Therefore, as by the offence of *one*, judgement came upon *all* men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of *one* the free gift came upon *all* men unto justification of life. For, as by *one* man's disobedience, *many* were made sinners, so by the obedience of *one* shall many be made righteous.' A rabbi would have expressed all these long Greek sentences in Hebrew in a shorter way. The measure of goodness, free gift, love, grace, is far greater than that of condemnation, death, punishment, and rebuke. If Adam's sin brought death on his seed, on all his generations up to the end of ages, surely Christ's death brought life to the many.

A teacher of the second century deduces by exactly the same method the law of future reward held in store for the righteous. R. Jose ben Halafta, who lived and taught in Sepphoris about 150 c.E., said : ' Go and learn from Adam's case. Adam was commanded to obey *one* precept. He transgressed it. Behold how *many* generations were condemned to death? Which measure is greater? That of punishment or that of reward? Surely the latter. Now, if

the sin of *one* brings death on *many*, surely the obedience of *one* brings merit to *many*.¹ One cannot help suggesting that the judge and teacher of Sepphoris applied here the old rule of the relationship existing between the two measures to a polemical attack against Paul. He substitutes for Jesus' death the obedience to the law. He chooses purposely, as examples for acquiring merits, refraining from prohibited food and fasting on the Day of Atonement, since radicals, like Paul, abolished the dietary law, and discarded, like Barnabas, the ceremony of the great day in the life of the Jews for the death of Jesus. Whether R. Jose read the Epistles or not, cannot be proved. Yet one thing is quite certain—that his teachings are not free from polemical utterances against Christian views and doctrines. It is further established that the rule about the two measures plays a prominent part in his Haggada, and the long line of disputes and dialogues between him and a Roman lady of high social standing and gnostic propensities make it plausible that he may have learned something about Christian views as well. However that may be, his and his colleague's, R. Judah ben Jlai's, words make it clear that some rabbis at least were, in their religious outlook, above the common practice, or idea of 'tit for tat.' In the precincts of justice, in legal life, how could, or how can, one free oneself from the idea of measure for measure? God as the Supreme Judge is subjected, in theory at least, by the doctors of law to a generally accepted legal standard. In daily life, even a human being must not apply measure for measure. Moses, for instance, did not say: 'Since they murmur and revolt against me, behold I will not pray mercy and forgiveness of sin for them!'—no, he entreated for them.² The law of Lev. xix. 17—'Thou shalt not avenge, nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people'—is expounded by the teachers in this way: '*Thou shalt not*

¹ Torath Kohanim, p. 25b.

² Mekilta of R. Simon ben Jochai, p. 81.

avenge.' How far does the force of avenging reach? If one tells his neighbour: 'Lend me your sickle!' and he does not do so, and to-morrow he comes to borrow his friend's axe, he must not say: 'I will not lend you, just as you did not lend me yesterday.' And, in case he remarks: 'I am not like you, but I lend you my axe!' this is called grudge, and strictly prohibited. Consequently 'tit for tat' is condemned, even in ordinary social intercourse. How much more that such an attitude could not have been ascribed to God in rabbinic theology. Yet how can the teaching of 'measure for measure' be interpreted? Surely as a legal device, nothing more and nothing less. Such is the legal mind! Even a man of Hillel's piety and benevolence, when he saw a skull floating on the water, exclaimed: 'Because thou drownedst, they drowned thee, and, in the end, they that drowned thee shall be drowned.' Hillel expresses in this terse sentence the same idea which we found in the Gospels, in the Wisdom of Solomon, and in the Midrash. Hillel is our earliest witness, whose date can be ascertained, for this teaching. When he saw the skull floating, he, or his pupils, may have been agitated by the cruel fate of the drowned man; some might have even doubted God's justice and love. What an end of a godlike human life! Hillel told them: 'Surely God cannot be unjust, but the measure which the deceased meted out to others—namely, drowning people—was meted out to him.'

R. Judah ben Jlai, the chief spokesman of the school in Usha, as pointed out before, could not agree to distorting the Jewish conception of God by the inferior 'tit for tat.' Was he the only teacher who, in spite of his legalism and orthodoxy, was roused to protest against such a degradation of the nature of God? Surely there must be a number of brothers in arms who shared his view and followed his teaching. Several sentences by many teachers can be enumerated here, showing that God's grace and love is

greater than man's merits and deeds. God is far superior than to 'measure' man's deeds, good or evil. God is granting love and mercy, even to those who have no works to deserve them. He does it for *His own sake*, or for His Name's sake. R. Judah's opponent, R. Nehemiya, who frequently opposes the teacher of Usha, thinks that, whatever merits one gathers, or good one does, they are infinitesimally small in the sight of God's love and mercy, providence and charity, bestowed upon mankind. Man's works and deeds are not enough to come up to the degree of deserving God's grace. Noah, according to R. Hanina b. Hama, possessed just an ounce of merit, yet he was saved by God's grace! Is that 'measure for measure'? R. Eleazar ben Pedath says: 'God recompenses each man according to his own works, yet, in case he has none, God supplies him with His grace and love.' This teaching is repeated by one of the youngest Palestinian teachers, R. Judah b. Shalom, and others.¹ Surely teachers who held such views of God's grace could not have preached in the same breath 'tit for tat'? They likewise taught their audiences and pupils that by doing good one lays up treasures in heaven; yet, they added, the biggest store is reserved for those who could not gather treasures by their own effort, and are granted them by the grace of an all-merciful God and Father.²

If 'tit for tat' is more, as Dr. Montefiore teaches, according to rabbinic liking than the idea of God's love and grace, how will he explain scores of passages in the Talmud and Midrash about *forgiveness of sin*? A man who reads the Torah, is engaged in charity, and has lost his children, all his sins are pardoned.³ A man who observes the Sabbath, his

¹ For fuller details v. my *Doctrine of Merits*, London, 1920, Index, s.v. 'Grace of God.'

² See, for particulars, my article, 'The Treasures in Heaven and upon Earth,' in *London Quarterly Review*, October 1919, 216-28.

³ B. Ber. 5a, a Mishna teacher before R. Jochanan bar. Nappacha, who lost all his sons; v. also Siphre Deut., § 82, Mechilta.

sins are forgiven, even if he is an idol-worshipper.' He who regrets his sins is pardoned at once,' or, according to another version, a man is forgiven if he feels ashamed for his sins.* Man's sins and iniquities are wiped off if he is capable of mourning and weeping over a good man's departure from this world.* R. Jochanan bar Nappacha reiterates his teaching of God's forgiveness by saying: 'In the time of the Temple the altar atoned for our sins; nowadays the family table, where the poor and needy share our meals, wipes our sins off.' A similar trend can be detected when one finds that the reading of the biblical portions of the sacrifices brings atonement.* Older than the third century C.E. are the views that dwelling in Palestine,* the saying of 'Amen' after the prayers,* lead to forgiveness of sin. Probably on this idea is based Sirach's sentence: 'He who honours his father will atone for sins.' The custom, or conception, that by reading a special portion, or certain verses, from sacred writings causes absolution from sins finds a very interesting parallel in the religious system of Iran. A priest reads the Vendidad in the name of a layman, by which the person achieves atonement.** The strange fact that the teachers of the third century emphasize and dwell on the problem of atonement may be ascribed to the feeling current among

* R. Huyya ben Abba in the name of R. Jochanan bar Nappacha, b. Sabh. 118b, 119a; Pirke R. Elieser viii., Midr. Ps. xlviii. 6.

* R. Hanina b. Papa. b. Hag. 5a.

* Rabbah b. Hanina the Elder, in the name of Rab. b. Berakoth 12b.; v. also Midr. Ps. xxx.b. For a different version the Yemenite Midrash ba Gadol, Deut., p. 2d (MS. Brit. Mus.), has to be compared.

* b. Sabh. 105; b. Moed Katan 25a.

* B. Berakoth 55a.

* B. Taamith 27b.

* Siphre Deut., § 842. B. Ketuboth 111a.

* B. Sabbath 119.

* Chap. iii. 8; v. Charles's *Apocrypha*, p. 824, where reference is made to the custom of a son praying publicly in the synagogue on the anniversary of his parent's death.

** Spiegel, *Iranische Alterthumskunde*, vol. iii., p. 697.

Jews in Galilee in the third century, as reported by the Church Father, Origen, that since the abolition of sacrifices they were lost in sin and iniquity, defiled by impurity and impiety.¹ These teachers and preachers comforted and uplifted their despairing and hopeless brethren by teaching them that there are many substitutes available, and as forceful as sacrifices, such as charity, prayer, fasts, &c. Yet they must have pre-supposed that there is no limit for God's goodness in forgiving the sinner his sins, and restoring him to his Father's love. Could that be the case if the 'tit for tat' theology really had permeated their minds and hearts?

Yet it is no good kicking against the pricks by denying that some teachers did teach the doctrine of measure for measure! And some, who taught that forgiveness and absolution can be gained by repentance or by observances, pronounced in the same breath that God punishes or rewards measure for measure. Apart from the by no means negligible fact that legal aspects have been translated into moral maxims, one has to consider in this aspect of God's nature a necessary weapon against gnostic attacks, which upset and worried a great deal the mind of Jews and Christians alike in the first four centuries. Gnostics, and other heretics as well, taunted Bible-reading Jews and Christians with their questions, asking: Why were some people exalted and glorified, others condemned and put in the pillory? Abraham, Aaron, David, &c., are considered good and pious men, yet they were sinners and murderers, idolators and immoral. There is a straight line from ancient heretics, via English deists and Voltaire, to present-day super-critics of the Bible who repeat these obsolete charges. On the other hand, the generations of the flood, of the tower, Cain and Korah, Nebuchanezzar and Nimrod, Sennacherib and Pharaoh, are depicted as models of virtuous and saintly people, and yet

¹ v. Marmorstein's 'Deux renseignements d'Origen sur les Juifs,' *Revue des Études Juives*, vol. lxxi., 1920, pp. 190-200, esp. pp. 192 ff.

severely punished by the God of the Jews, the Demiurgos.¹ To avert these calumnies, which originated out of spite, hatred of Judaism, antagonism of the everlasting message of God, contrived by perverted minds and misguided pupils, the teachers could not fail to point out that God is just, and His justice is 'measure for measure.' There may have been teachers and preachers who believed in this principle, so often repeated without being aware of its inappropriateness in speaking of God. Others—and they were not in the minority—were fully aware that God is above 'tit for tat'; His retribution is less than the full measure deserved by the sinner, and His reward is by far superior to the treasures mortal beings can lay up, and merits they may acquire. Rabbinic ideas of religion and theological conceptions cannot be understood without consideration of their changes and continuity, variations and stability. This doctrine is one of the typical instances of the history of the origin and development, alteration and application, of a rabbinic conception.

A. MARMORSTEIN.

¹ Details and proofs for all these charges can be read at greater length in my 'The Background of the Haggada,' *Hebrew Union College Annual*, vol. vi., pp. 147 ff.

Benn's Ninepenny Novels.—Mr. Benn has made a notable venture in this new Library. Wrappers are dispensed with and a strong and attractive paper cover is substituted for cloth binding. The volumes are clearly printed on good paper and slip easily into a pocket or satchel. They cover 160 pages and the first six stories by J. D. Beresford, Naomi Royde Smith, Mrs. Belloc Lowndes, Eden Phillpotts, Storm Jameson and Alec Waugh will give two or three hours of real pleasure to readers. Mr. Benn has been fortunate in securing such gifted writers and the little volumes are very tempting both inside and out. Such a spirited innovation deserves a big success.

WITNESS TO THE TRUTH

I.

TO thought that has not broken with the old sanctities of life, religion, as such, is always one of the most real things in the world. Such ultimate and supreme reality, indeed, religion has, in its own right, always possessed, but this unique prerogative has often been denied or ignored in the interests of the remoter majesty of abstract thought, whose more shadowy grandeur has often been taken for the sign of a more august authority. Our modern thought, however, even when most intimately concerned with its own affairs, is no lover of solitude : it has its home and its life only amid the concrete realities of the world and of human life. It speaks to us, not of this man's thought or of that, but of the energizing and organizing Reason of the world, and it lays hold of the ultimate particulars of the world—of the world of Nature, and of the nearer world of human life—and lifts them up and transfigures them, and sets them before us once again as essentially spiritual. The world is Appearance, if you will, but it is the appearance of Reality, and that Reality is Spiritual Reality.

The ideas of thought and life, at once poetic and chivalrous, that, for their own sake, have always been among the nearer sanctities of the pure in heart, have, in our own day, received anew the consecration of thought, and, because of that consecration, come to us not merely as fairy visions of the remotely possible, but as setting forth the inmost reality and energizing life of the actual, and they tell us that this world of ours is in fact what faith, and honour, and love have always held it to be. Verily, this is the Lord's doing, and is marvellous in our eyes ; but the marvel does not end here, for the thought that this confirms our natural faith in truth

and goodness cannot vindicate or confirm itself. Just in the degree to which it accomplishes its characteristic work of making explicit the immanent and essential sanctity of experience, in that same degree does it approach the confession that the last word about the last things of life cannot come from itself. Just because it is not a doctrine but a method, not a metaphysic but a logic, its message is always, in the last analysis, a message to faith and not to knowledge : it can give us no ultimate credentials of its own validity. It is an instrument of interpretation, and cannot verify itself : we have to take it upon trust, and to take its interpretations upon trust. It essays to trace for us the progressive realization of its ideals in Nature and in life, but its last word about those ideals is that they are native to itself, and that the application of them to experience is, and must always be—unless we could become as God—a venture of faith. Now, it is with this venture of faith, and with the practical attitude which it involves of permanent dependence upon the order of the world—it is with this that religion, in its essential character, is immediately concerned, and it is because religion thus goes down to the very roots of life and of thought, to the very foundations of our practical life, that it justly claims an ultimate reality and a sovereign worth.

Religion is, thus, always practical. It is not another sort of speculation, but a trust—a practical trust, and the practical discipline of that trust. The point is soon reached at which speculation, even of the loftiest Platonic order, has to confess that it is only speculation—that, although essaying to give man a doctrine of the world, it can only give him a hope, and that hope one concerning which it can say nothing. Now, it is the hope thus left to itself that religion takes in hand, not to justify it—at least, not to thought—but to confirm it, and to vindicate it in life.

Religion, then, is always practical. It deals with man's practical needs—with the very deepest of those needs ; it deals with them for a practical end, and it deals with them in

a practical way. It brings to man no abstract creed—man has got beyond all the creeds when, in sober earnest, he turns to religion—but a sure and certain hope, a faith that maketh not ashamed, and that reaches out beyond appearances to the inner truth of things, and so lays hold, as nothing else can, on eternal life.

Religion is not knowledge, nor even belief, but trust : it builds us up—not directly and immediately, that is—not into an orthodox confession, but into a living faith ; it issues, not in a creed, but in a character ; not in definitions of the Supreme Reality in the midst of which we live, and move, and have our being, but in a reverent and child-like trust in that Reality as it comes to us through the veil of Appearance.

Hope and trust are the deepest facts of life—and if love is the greatest of them all, it is only because in it hope and trust are at their highest—hope and trust are the deepest facts of life, and lie beyond every other care than that of religion. The particularism of bygone days, which set forth the individual as complete in himself, and as sufficient unto himself, is an abandoned creed of thought. It is not good for man to be alone, and, therefore, God has not left him alone, but, both in Nature and in life—and most of all in life—has appointed for his daily sustenance a manifest ministry of grace which besets him behind and before, meeting him on every hand, and on every hand binding him to the divine order, linking him to the divine life, by ties truly called sacramental.

What is true of character as a whole is true, also, of the details of character. Every element in character needs its own discipline and its own nurture ; hope and trust are no exceptions, and the discipline and nurture they need they find, and can find only in religion. They are not left to the fortuitous corroboration of particular experiences ; they are taken up by a divine ministry which can dispense with such accidents, and which, while it can and does make them triumphant ~~in~~ experience, can and does also make them

triumphant *over* experience, can and 'does transform them into an energizing faith that overcomes the world.

At first, it is true, the hope is vague and the trust inarticulate, but the breath of God is breathed into them, and the Spirit of God passeth over them, and, by a discipline which we must always call providential, even when seemingly most human, they grow at length into the full and clear assurance of a reasonable faith. Now the discipline whereby this change is wrought comes to us through the concrete realities of daily life. *Solvitur ambulando* : a practical attitude towards the world can be disciplined and confirmed only by practical experience, by practical contact with the world ; character can be developed and trained only in and by action ; our life can grow only by the actual effort and exercise of living.

In each of its aspects, therefore—as a primary trust and as the discipline of that trust—religion is essentially practical, and has its life in the midst of the actual order of common experience by which we are daily encompassed. In very truth, it comes thus, not as the negation of common life, but as the fulfilment of it.

II.

Religion, therefore, mediates to man the ultimate truth of things, in so far, at least, as this concerns the practical ordering of his life ; but it reveals that truth to him, not in knowledge, nor in thought, but in the assurance of hope. It rests upon human need and human aspiration, but its validity is always of God. This is true not only of that Christian faith in which we stand, and by which we live, but of all the religions of the world, in so far, that is, as they are truly religions, and not philosophies or rituals under another name.

Neither our reason nor our conscience will to-day permit us to explain away as unworthy or trivial the faiths in which the vast majority of our brethren have lived and died. Each of them, in its own time and place, has veritably given to

man some assurance for the hope that is in him, and has been a symbol and expression of the spiritual order of the world and of the higher meaning of life.

The high abstractions of our modern thought seem, it is true, to do more than justice to the cruder religions of our race, and to give them a completeness and a dignity they themselves make no claim to. This, however, is only because they have not become fully intelligible to themselves. They are groping blindly after that which they know not, and which they can grasp only, as it were, fragmentarily, in fragmentary symbols which they do not even know to be either fragmentary or symbolic. We, however, who read them in the light of history, see in them more than they themselves know of ; we see in them the same need and the same effort that inspire and shape our fuller faith, and we are compelled to regard them, equally with that fuller faith we ourselves confess, as serious attempts to pass to the inner reality of things, as serious attempts to link the little order of this everyday life of earth with that larger order upon which our ultimate trust is placed, and which we dimly discern in and beyond experience. It matters not what precise form these early attempts may take, nor in what particular belief or practice they issue. They always mean more than they are, and, whatever be the concrete results they actually achieve, they always lift life somewhat above 'the dark edges of the sensual ground' ; they always bring into life something that makes them at least a potential idealism ; they always widen life's outlook, and bring within the range of its vision a background of ultimate reality that is, at least potentially, spiritual.

We have, however, not exhausted the significance of the world's religions when we have thus dealt with them on the human side. We have, indeed, told the truth, but not the whole truth, not even the most significant part of it. If it be true to say that, in every form of religion, man is seeking after God and, in a measure, finding Him, it is equally true

to say that therein God is seeking after man, and in measure finding him.

As Christians we have, of course, been taught to believe that God has thus sought and found those who stand in one particular succession—that to the Jews first, and then to our own fathers in the faith, He manifestly declared His presence and ministered His grace ; that in the old time before us He separated Israel from the nations that knew Him not, and gave unto it laws and ordinances, a priesthood and a sanctuary, and the wonderful ministry of the prophets, and that in later years, when the fullness of the time had come, He gathered unto Himself, from out of all nations, another people to be His new Israel, and that unto them He made a fuller revelation of His name, unto them He gave His more especial presence, and unto them He committed a more especial ministry of His grace—as Christians we have been taught to believe all this, but as Christians we are bound to believe much more than this. He who has thus condescended to our humanity is no mere sovereign, who simply for His own good pleasure elected to bless a chosen few—capricious even in blessing, like some of earth's despots. He is one who has declared and shown Himself to be our Father, and not only *our* Father, but the Father of all who in every age and in every land have ever spoken with human lips.

There are, we know, fathers according to the flesh who are no strangers to unjust preferences, but dare we charge such to the Most High ? Must not we rather hold that since all souls are His, He, the Father, careth for all ?—that the other sheep which are not of this fold, nor, to our human seeing, of any fold, are yet not beyond and without the Shepherd's care ? The one sheep that was lost, we know, was not forgotten, nor did it find its own way back to the fold—the shepherd sought it until he found it. So must it surely be with God. Since it is by the word of His mouth that men live, we cannot think that He has been silent to any age or to any race. We have learned from the olden days that He

has never left Himself without a witness in the world ; but, through the things that are made, has ever declared unto men His eternal power and Godhead ; we must now widen the bounds of our faith, and believe that, in like manner, He has never left men anywhere or at any time without His grace—without such ministries of sustenance and healing as they could receive and bear. A God who did less than this surely could not be the Father whom Christ came to reveal, and to whom He taught us to pray.

While, then, in the religions of the world we see man reaching out after God, we also see therein God reaching out after man ; and it is the condescension of God, and not the aspiration of man, that makes our faith profitable unto life.

We, therefore, do not reach the deepest significance of man's religious history until we have viewed that history from the divine side as well as from the human, and marked therein, not only the work of man and the story of his fears, his longing, and his trust, but also the presence and power of God, whose saving love casts out our fears, satisfies our longing, and confirms our trust.

Looked at from without and below, the history of religion is merely a part of natural history. Everywhere the vessels said to contain the water of life are unmistakably earthen vessels ; everywhere rite and symbol have been framed and fashioned by art and man's device ; everywhere the creeds of men speak in the language of men, and their definitions utter the thoughts of men. Religions rise and fall, and one succeeds to another, and every change seems to hold its natural place as a natural event in the natural order of the changing world. Even the very adaptation of a faith to the people who profess it—its adaptation to their needs, its adaptation to their nature, and its general congruity with the historical and other conditions of their life, seem to make it all the more human, all the more natural ; seem to link it all the more closely to the natural order of the world, to what we sometimes call the secular processes of history.

Yes, all this is true, but it is not the entire truth, for it simply shows us one aspect of religion, and that aspect not the highest. Above nature there is God, and behind the history of the world our Father's love, and that love can never be a mere spectator of life—of the hopes and fears, the strivings and the failures, the prayers and the sighs of the souls that are its own. So, because God is in very truth our Father, He comes down to us, His children—always speaking in such words as we can understand, always revealing such truth as we can bear, always ministering the help we most need, and all the time ever leading us onward and upward to higher life and fuller manhood ; all the time preparing us, by each advance we make, for higher and fuller ministries of His grace, which in due season, and in His own way, He never fails to send us.

In thus condescending to our need God answers our faith and justifies it. At the bidding of impulses stronger and deeper than even reason itself, we fling ourselves upon the visible order in which we live and move and have our being and trust it to meet the needs of our life—trust it to respond to our hunger and thirst after righteousness, and to our longing for truth ; and, in the midst of that visible order, God meets with us by the way, and justifies our trust.

The deepest reality of religion, therefore, comes from God, and not from man. We can but bring our earthen vessels to the wells of life : the living water we there seek must always be the gift of God.

III.

The divine response to man's need which thus constitutes the life of religion always comes to man in concrete and practical form, and along the paths of practical life. It does not come as a supernatural gift of light unrelated to the common experience of life ; it comes in the concrete forms of that experience as the response of love to trust.

Man is not sufficient unto himself, nor is his knowledge adequate to his need. By the deepest needs and impulses of his life he is carried out of himself beyond the scope of his knowledge and the range of his thought, and is compelled, whether he will or no, to trust the visible order whose inmost reality ever escapes him ; is compelled, whether he will or no, to walk by faith and not by sight. It is this faith that is the human basis of religion, just as the confirming and quickening response of the divine love is its informing life. Now, because this faith lives and moves and has its being in depths where neither thought nor knowledge can ever penetrate, the divine response to it must come otherwise than through knowledge or through thought. How then does it come ? In truth, we know not. 'The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh and whither it goeth.' So is it with the grace that answers our faith. Come to us we know most surely that it does, for we feel the quickening breath of its presence, but how it comes we know not. Can we say, even among men, how love speaks to the heart of love ? Speak we know it does, but how does it speak ? This only can we say : it takes the common things of life, and makes them eloquent in a language not their own. A new light comes into the face, a tenderer tone into the voice, a softer pressure into the clasped hands, and in a moment we know, and yet know not how we know. So it is with the divine love as it comes out to meet our human trust and hope. It breathes a new glory and a new power into life, and we own its presence while we know not how it comes. It takes the things of earth and makes them parables and symbols of the things of heaven. It does more—it takes the common things of life and makes them the very bread of God whereby we live, and we know that we live, while we know not how we live.

All this is true wherever in the religions of the world the divine love comes down to human need, but most especially is it true of our Christian faith. 'I,' said our Lord, 'I am

the Bread of Life ; he that cometh to Me shall never hunger, and he that believeth on Me shall never thirst.' The life of God is the only self-sufficient life : as for man, his sufficiency must ever come from God, and it must come ' not of works, but by grace.' God alone is our sufficiency, and in divers ways He ministers that sufficiency to us, but most especially in the gift of His Son.

When the Word became flesh and dwelt among us, He came to us as the Bread of God broken to our need. Hence the Incarnate Life has for our Christian faith and thought a unique significance. It was God's complete answer to human questionings concerning the heart of things—concerning the ground of our ultimate trust. It was a revelation of the truth acted out in life, and, because it was so acted out, the common people received it gladly.

' To this end was I born,' said our Lord, ' and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth.' Now what was the witness of our Lord ? In part it was the direct witness of spoken words. He spoke ' as one having authority '—' as never man spake' ; but if the Incarnate Life had passed away in words, would it ever have become what it actually did become—the turning-point of the world's history and the permanent centre of human trust ? No, no, we must go behind the words to the life, and behind the life to Him who lived. The self-emptying of God, the divine humiliation and acceptance of death, ' even the death of the cross '—these are the cardinal facts that light up the whole history of the Incarnate Life and that stand for all time as the complete and sufficient assurance that the children of men, with all their strivings, all their hopes, and all their fears, are also the children of God, and that sovereign at the very heart of things is a love which, because it is our Father's, can never fail us. So once again the Bread of God is broken to our need.

If the life of Christ were but a life of human goodness, and His death but another of the world's martyrdoms, neither

His life nor His death would avail much to answer our questionings or confirm our trust. Our trust goes out, not to the human teacher or the human martyr, but to the loving God who in 'the form of a servant' gave Himself once for all in fullest satisfaction of our deepest need.

'This is My body broken for you.' These are sacramental words by which, in our Christian sacrifice, we set forth the mystery of that self-sacrifice of God. They do, however, but feebly suggest the divine reality. A broken body ! He gave us His very self.

It is only in the light of the Cross that we see the full significance of the earthly life of our Lord, for on the Cross the deepest secret of that life was revealed. Apart from the Cross and from all that the Cross means, the record of His life is simply one of the world's countless biographies ; but when we read that record at the foot of Calvary it becomes unique. The Son of God came into our human life, we know not how, 'and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father' ; He spake to us concerning the Kingdom of God, and, because it was He who spake and not another, His words are still to us spirit and life ; He went about blessing the little children and 'healing all manner of diseases,' taking part in man's common life to sanctify it, and meeting human sin with words of pardoning love and saving power ; and in all this we see the Bread of God visibly broken before our very eyes, in all this we find the things seen and heard lifted up into sacraments of divine life, into living revelations of divine truth.

The Incarnate Life is the gospel in act. In it a human life became organic to the divine ; in it the energizing love of God came intimately into human experience ; and, although we know not the manner of its coming, we acknowledge its presence and feel its power, and feed upon it in our hearts by faith with thanksgiving.

ARTHUR BOUTWOOD.

CHRISTOLOGY: ITS STARTING-POINT AND PLACE IN CHRISTIAN THINKING

THE distinguishing feature of the Christian message in every age has been what we may call its Incarnational affirmation. 'God was in Christ,' said St. Paul. 'The Word became flesh,' said the author of the Fourth Gospel. It will, I think, be generally agreed, both by Christian and by non-Christian, that, if this affirmation should cease to be made, Christianity will have ceased to be itself; or, to put the matter otherwise, so large a departure will have been made from the past that the resultant religion will no longer be Christianity.

Often what is called the 'divinity' of Christ has been regarded as the test of the standing Church. The term Incarnation seems, however, in every way the better word for embodying the Christian message to the world. For, on the one hand, the acceptance of the 'divinity' of Christ may co-exist with the rejection of His real humanity; and in such a case no one outside the ranks of the extreme 'fundamentalists' will be deceived into thinking that such a position is Christian. This, perhaps, is an over-statement; for outside the ranks of any determined 'ism' there are those who, confronted with the difficulty of thinking things together, have such a conception of our Lord as makes them hesitate to affirm what the Church has always affirmed, viz. that He was truly and perfectly man. If, for example, He should be regarded as One who possessed the attributes of omnipotence and omniscience it is obvious that if 'humanity' be attributed to Him it is not humanity that has any meaning for ourselves. Or, if, again, what is called His 'sinlessness' is so conceived that He knew nothing of the moral stress of our common humanity, then it is again obvious, I think, that no reality is attached to the affirmation of *His* humanity. Or if, again, He is conceived as a centre of two consciousnesses,

a 'divine' consciousness and a 'human' consciousness, each being conveniently affirmed to 'explain' certain sayings or certain acts of Christ, it is obvious, again, that we have lost the unity of His person. On this issue, I have heard the following question asked in all seriousness of a candidate for the Christian ministry : Will you instance some acts and sayings of our Lord which He did and said as man, and some acts and sayings which He did and said as God ? Such a question, if it means anything, means that His consciousness is conceived in a dualistic manner ; and this would seem to involve, either a 'two natures' doctrine founded upon an obsolete metaphysic, or a 'two consciousness' doctrine founded upon an unintelligible psychology. But, however that may be, the Christian message is not that here Christ spoke as man, there as God ; here He revealed a human consciousness, there a divine consciousness : but that in this one personality God Himself is uniquely manifested. The Christian message is not that Jesus was God *and* man ; it is that 'God was in Christ.' And, if I may speak for myself, I cannot but agree with the late Dr. Gwatkin when he said : 'Human and divine *in alternation* destroys the whole conception of the incarnation' (*The Knowledge of God*, Vol. II., p. 115).

And, on the other hand, the term 'divinity' is, I think, more open to ambiguity than the term Incarnation. Not, indeed, that the latter term has not been variously employed and variously conceived. But, at least, it involves two ideas, however variously we may conceive them : first, it makes us think of a man, and, second, it makes us think of a unique revelation of God in man. I do not wish to make too much of the point ; but the word 'divinity' lends itself to such a retort as that given by the late Sir Henry Jones, in his early days, to one who scented heresy in him : 'So far from denying the divinity of Christ, I do not deny the divinity of any man.' Such a reply may be regarded, in the circumstances, as an *argumentum ad hominem*, or as a

clever debating retort. Neither clever question nor clever answer, however, takes us in this region very far. The real issue is, How are we to regard 'divinity' as ascribed to Christ? And if it is conceived as making impossible, on the one hand, the affirmation of His real humanity, and, on the other, the affirmation of His uniqueness in humanity, it is, I think, obvious that we have left a truncated Christianity. The Incarnation has been robbed of its Christian meaning.

It is for such reasons that the word Incarnation is a better word to describe the Church's christological faith than the word divinity. For, without solving all the problems necessarily inherent in such a conception, it does stand for this declaration : that God in essential nature is revealed, or has spoken to humanity, in an historic human person, one Jesus of Nazareth ; that in One who entered the world through the womb of a woman, who had flesh as we have flesh, who lived at a specific period of time, in a definite place, the main lineaments of whose portrait we find in our Gospels, there is given God's supreme revelation of Himself to the world.

It is obvious, I think, that this affirmation raises two kinds of question : first, what we may call *historical* questions, and, second, what we may call *philosophical* questions. The first inquiry is concerned with such questions as the historical reality of the Jesus of history—what did He think, what did He say, what did He do—the historical reality of the Christian Church—what did it think, what did it say, what did it do—and, what is the historical path leading from the one to the other. As far as Christology is concerned, the crucial historical issue is to trace the path leading from Jesus' thought about Himself to the Church's thought about Him. The philosophical inquiry goes deeper. It is concerned with *validity*. The two inquiries are, however, interpenetrative. The philosopher's discussion must rest upon the historian's conclusions. In fact, the historian's conclusions might, conceivably, render unnecessary any

philosophic discussion. If, for example, it were to be demonstrated that no Jesus ever lived, then it would obviously be mere spurious dialectic to seek to show the validity of the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation. Or if, again, it were ever to be historically demonstrated that Jesus was no better, or no worse, than ourselves, that He claimed no unique consciousness of God, then whatever the Church might be proved to have said about Him and claimed for Him every one endowed with average common sense would recognize that there is nothing to discuss. These things require, I think, to be said in an age when some transcendentalists think it is possible to erect a Christian apologetic upon historical scepticism.

I must confine myself here to questions on the plane of *historical* inquiry.

The Incarnational message of Christianity involves an historical assertion. If we cannot say anything about the Jesus of history we are not in the position to say what we mean by the Incarnation, and so, further, are precluded from even beginning the task of establishing its validity. As far as I understand the matter, therefore, not only the Christ-myth theorists are debarred from a faith in the Incarnation; all those who take up a sceptical attitude as to the possibility of saying who He really was are in the same category.

Christianity cannot sever herself from the historic Jesus without ceasing to be herself. As the centuries pass and that Figure recedes into the more and more distant past, there will, I imagine, be the constant temptation, or endeavour, to regard the truth of Christianity as independent of history. The religious mind, bewildered by the many contradictory voices shouting, 'This, and this, and this is the historic Jesus,' may feel constrained to say, 'Let us construct a Christian theology independent of the whole historical issue.' Such a construction, however sincerely or religiously inspired, cannot maintain that 'the Word of God for this

world is Christ.' Dr. Deissmann has recently put the matter with insight and precision. 'If the Christian reflection on Jesus Christ is not to degenerate into an extravagant, phantastic gnos̄is, then it must be reflection on Him who was Jesus of Nazareth in history.' And, after referring to those mythologists who believe in a retrograde movement from an alleged primary cult-name to a secondary and unhistorical personal name, he goes on to say : 'The path of history leads from an historical personal name to a cult-name, from the gospel of Jesus of Nazareth to the cult of Jesus Christ the Lord. This path is also the path for Christology, and must remain the path of Christology' (*Mysterium Christi*, pp. 26-7).

Now the great task, I take it, for the Christian historian is to trace this path from the Jesus of history to the Christ of faith and of doctrine, from the Man Christ Jesus to the gospel of the Incarnation. There are few more vital issues than this—and few more difficult. The difficulty arises from the paucity of the materials with which he has to work ; or perhaps, keeping to our figure, from the scanty, or at least incomplete, traces left of that road by which he has to trace its course. Traces, of course, there are, and important traces. The historian's task is like that of the antiquarian seeking to track out an almost forgotten Roman road. Here a heap of stones, there an overgrown track ; and then, partly by excavation and partly by imagination and reasoning, he is able to say, 'Here ran the road.' And yet the Christian historian cannot adopt the attitude of detached, if zestful, inquiry which characterizes the scientific antiquarian. For there is a bourn to which that road leads wherein he has found a gospel which satisfies his deepest needs and answers his deepest questionings. There is for him, to use the language of the schools, a *terminus ad quem*, and this is nothing less than the unveiling of God's face in the Man Christ Jesus—not, let us add, such an explicated interpretation of that *terminus* as we find, for example, in the

Chalcedonian definition. A frank acknowledgement of this *terminus* does not mean that inquiry is proscribed or that conclusions are predetermined. It no more involves this in the case of the Christian historian than in the case of the anti-Christian historian—though I am well aware that a claim to unique dispassionateness of inquiry is often made by those whose conclusions are, from the Christian point of view, negative. This acknowledgement merely means that the issue is not merely a historical one. Inwoven within it are religious and philosophical considerations.

Here, however, it is important to note the difficulties confronting the historian. If he had a verbatim report of every word Jesus spoke, a complete narrative of every deed He performed, and the unfailing insight to read from these records the secret of His inner consciousness, the starting-point would be secure. If, further, a complete record of the thoughts and activities of the early apostles were before him, if, above all, he knew exactly and infallibly the sources of Paul's thought, he would be able to trace with approximate assurance the first, and most important, steps of the path leading from that starting-point. It is, however, obvious that none of these *desiderata* is his. This involves that he must bring to bear upon fragmentary data what one can only call historical and psychological insight.

The crucial question here is the *consciousness of Jesus*. This must be the real *terminus a quo* for the Christian historian. This is the starting-point of the Christian movement. It must also be the real starting-point for the christologist. The question is, Had Jesus a unique consciousness of God? It would avail nothing, as far as the *Christian* is concerned, to know that the apostles made unique claims for Jesus if he had no certitude that the inner consciousness and outward life of Jesus were compatible with those claims. I cannot myself see, as far as the *Christian* historian is concerned, that there is much satisfaction to be derived from any account of the transition from the Jesus of history to the Christ of

faith which does not find in the consciousness, and claim, of Jesus the origination of that faith. In other words, the only satisfactory link in the historical chain is that which connects our Lord's own claim for Himself with the apostles' claim for Him. No other link is adequate for a Christian apologetic. The historian of early Christian doctrine is concerned, and rightly concerned, with the question how far such belief is continuous with the modes of thought of the Judaistic or Hellenistic environment. He seeks, in other words, to find the moulds in which the christological creed came to be shaped. An important task, no doubt. But much more important, for the Christian theologian, is the question, What was the content poured into these moulds? To him the metal is more important than the mould, the historical truth than the thought-forms by which it is expressed.

Now, when we weigh up the whole significance of the early Christian movement, as represented in the Acts and Epistles of the New Testament, it is not too much to say, with Dr. Rawlinson, that 'it is antecedently probable that there were links of connexion between the disciples' faith in our Lord and our Lord's own belief with regard to 'Himself' (*New Testament Doctrine of the Christ*, p. 46). The question, then, is whether in the Gospels themselves we can find those links, and how, precisely, they are to be understood. To me the latter part of this question is the more important modern issue.

For that there are links, to be discovered in the Evangelical narratives, cannot, I think, be denied. Without entering upon a meticulous critical scrutiny of the Gospels—a task demanding a treatise—there is for the average intelligent reader the *total impression* of a unique moral and spiritual personality. Jesus is, as truly as in Matthew Arnold's day, over our heads. Our inner certitude of the moral and spiritual sublimity of Jesus is neither gained nor lost by the negative process of answering objections raised in regard to specific incidents—such, for example, as are raised by a book

like that of Mr. F. Lenwood (*Jesus—Lord or Leader ?*). Any clever mind can argue either way, when this or that incident is scrutinized with a view to discovering whether it does or does not 'reveal moral imperfection in Jesus. Criticism divorced from historical and psychological insight is of little worth. My own total impression gained from my reading of the Gospels—I say it frankly—is that here is One who was above the heads of His narrators, and above the heads of us moderns. Nor do I find it easy to understand how the disciples came to regard a worshipful attitude as natural towards Him if He had impressed them otherwise.

The impression which Jesus made upon His disciples is, then, the link uniting Him with the christological faith. But still the question remains, How is this link to be understood ? The question is, Can we get from the disciples' impression to the *consciousness* of Him who made the impression ?

Must we be here reverently agnostic, and say with Harnack that this is 'His secret' ? But if it were a wholly unknown secret, then all that the historian of Christology could do would be to maintain that the faith of the Church rests primarily upon an inference—an inference from the moral and spiritual sublimity of Jesus. I do not, I trust, underestimate the place which inference may have in apologetic statement ; but there is something more, and deeper. That 'something more' is *our Lord's consciousness of God*.

What can we say about this ? This is indeed a 'Holy of holies' to the Christian. But, inasmuch as this is the most important of all questions for the christologist, we cannot but seek, with the shoes from off our feet, to enter in. Further, the fact that theologians have come back from that 'Holy of holies' bearing such different material for their christological construction delivers us from our hesitant diffidence. Every endeavour, whether of theologians of the right or of the left, to interpret the self-revealing words of our Lord is an endeavour to read that secret.

The crucial issue is *our Lord's consciousness of Sonship*.

It is obvious to the historian of christological and trinitarian formulation that what is usually called the 'metaphysical Sonship' was woven into the texture of the later dogmatic system. And the question which here arises is, not the legitimacy or necessity of this inweaving, but whether the 'metaphysical Sonship' can be attributed to the consciousness of Jesus.

Many theologians would so attribute it. This, as far as I understand it, is the position of one of our ablest British christologists, Dr. H. R. Mackintosh. Speaking of the famous passage in Matt. xi. 25-7 (cf. Luke x. 21-2), he says: 'Looking both at Jesus' own mind and at Christian experience, there is no reason why we should not use the word metaphysical to denote this special Sonship, not as though metaphysical stood in contrast with ethical, but to mark the circumstance that this Sonship is part of the ultimate realities of being' (*The Person of Jesus Christ*, p. 28).¹ On the other hand, there are many who would regard this passage as 'a bolt from the Johannine sky,' and not to be attributed to Jesus Himself.

As this passage from Matthew brings the issue before us in its most definite form, we may be justified, in the interests of space, in confining our discussion to it. Neither of these ways of dealing with it seems to my own mind satisfactory. To extirpate the whole passage as unhistorical seems arbitrary. And, even if it could be extirpated, there are many other passages in the Gospels which involve a unique consciousness, or claim, on the part of Jesus. To me it seems a truer historical and psychological approach to the passage to ask how, in the light of the unique consciousness of God possessed by our Lord, we may understand His words. Nor does such an approach necessitate the view that Jesus had a consciousness of 'metaphysical Sonship.' It were surely

¹ I am not certain of Dr. Mackintosh's position, as there are other passages in his influential treatise which can be otherwise interpreted.

better to confine such a phrase to the later interpretations of the Church when it sought to make coherent the whole situation. 'Divine Sonship,' as the late Professor Pringle-Pattison said, 'could not even remotely suggest to Jewish ears the metaphysical relation which it afterwards came to signify in Christian theology' (*Studies in the Philosophy of Religion*, pp. 167-8). Is there any gain in supposing that it meant such to our Lord Himself? Should we not, in that case, be in danger of losing His real humanity, the unity of His consciousness, and, so, a real Incarnation?

Assuming the general authenticity of the passage, though not of its precise verbiage, must we not interpret it in the light of two main principles: first, the real humanity of Jesus, involving the unity of His consciousness; second, the unique certitude which He had of God? Interpreting these principles in the light of each other, may we not say that His claim to unique Sonship was the natural and inevitable way by which His unique certitude of God expressed itself in verbal claim? The Sonship of our Lord rises out of His direct, intimate knowledge of God; it is not that His knowledge of God rises out of His 'metaphysical Sonship.'

I do not, therefore, see that *in principle* we can reject what Harnack said: 'Rightly understood, the name of Son means nothing but the knowledge of God' (*What is Christianity?* p. 181). *Nothing but*; were it not better to say, *nothing less than*? As if the knowledge of God did not represent the highest goal of man's achieving! Yet, many theologians do less than justice to this method of approach to our Lord's consciousness. And I cannot escape the thought that they are so anxious—too anxious—to maintain the legitimacy and necessity of christological formulation that they would read it into His own consciousness, forgetting that thereby the loss is infinitely greater than the gain.

Nor does this method of approach mean that our Lord's filial relationship with God becomes, to use the words of

Dr. Mackintosh, 'a fact of temporal origin.' It means what, I think, is incontestable, namely, that His *consciousness* of Sonship *began to be*. If it did not begin to be, we should have to conceive that the Babe of Bethlehem came with a knowledge of this Sonship. We should thus, further, evacuate of its truthfulness the Gospel portraiture of One who *increased* in knowledge of God and man. The result would be to replace the Jesus of the Gospels, who indeed awes us into the acknowledgement of His inscrutable uniqueness, with a speculative, metaphysical riddle, of which we could say nothing that means anything to ourselves.

If we are to seek to read the consciousness of Jesus—and every one seeks to do this, no matter to what school of theological thought he adheres—we can only seek to do so in the light of our own experience of God. If we are to try to understand, we can only begin from our own minds; we cannot begin from any one else's, for the simple reason that our own is the only one we know in interior consciousness. No humility which does not recognize this is other than a spurious humility. If we are to stand at all, we can but stand on our own feet, we cannot borrow any one else's for the purpose. This does not mean that we make our own experience of God the measure of Christ's. A true humility will recognize that only if we had His insight could we penetrate the mystery of His experience. Nevertheless, His words can only mean something to those to whom they represent a reality known, however dimly, to themselves. And, if that be so, must we not, recognizing that He was truly and perfectly man, refuse to acquiesce in a speculative, metaphysical riddle, saying, for example, that here we are confronted with a consciousness which is not to be understood in merely ethical and spiritual terms. Rather, must we not declare that in His case it reached an intimacy, a peremptoriness, an abidingness, in comparison with the weak, distant, hesitating, fleeting character of the experience as it comes to us? Along this line of approach we may, I think,

confidently maintain that there is some historical basis for such Johannine passages as 'Before Abraham was, I am,' and 'I and the Father are one'—passages which cause uneasiness to theologians of the right, and which are regarded as non-historical interpretations, dictated by a mystic Logos philosophy, by theologians of the left. The hesitations of the former arise from the fact that they are loath to maintain that the Man Christ Jesus *remembered* as an event in past time, prior to His earthly life, an existence with God, for such a declaration would add gratuitous difficulties both to the interpretation of the Gospel portraiture of Jesus and to the trinitarian apologist. The dogmatisms of the latter arise, in large measure, from the lack of what I can only call spiritual insight.

For let us conceive that He grew in knowledge of God, and, so, in knowledge of what was involved in complete obedience to the Father's will (cf. Heb. v. 8). And so at last He comes to such a complete, direct certitude of God, to such a perfect dedication to His will, as throbs through the Evangelical narrative. What would this involve for His consciousness? Would it not mean this: that He came to transcend the spatial and temporal concepts of finitude which hem *us* in? That He reached a realm in which such categories were transcended? Have not we ourselves our *occasional* moments when *time* is transcended in the contemplation of God, when *space* is no more in an insight which brings emancipated loyalty to His will? And do not such experiences help *us* to understand, however dimly and inadequately, our Lord's experience of God?

Again I would suggest that such a method of approach to Christology means, not loss, but gain. For to attribute to the mind of our Lord the 'metaphysical Sonship' is, granting His real humanity, to regard it as an *interpretation* on His part. Even if historical investigation into the intellectual environment of the apostolic Church would permit that conclusion, what would be the position? Was Jesus a

metaphysician? Was He a 'philosopher of religion'? Was He the first speculative theologian? We hesitate to say what Jesus was *not*. But this, I think, we may say: that His insight, His direct experience of God, was on a far higher plane than the doctrinal interpretations and formulations of the Church. As direct religious insight is the fount of religious interpretation, so was the consciousness of God possessed by Jesus the fount of the inspiration of the intellectual formulations which sought to express, and conserve, it in human language. His 'oneness with God' should be regarded, not in any crude *numerical* sense, or *temporal* sense, or *spatial* sense, or *physical* sense, or *metaphysical* sense; He was 'one with God' *in sensu aeternitatis*.

This does not mean that we under-value the task of the theologians or that we regard their work as unnecessary. This suggestion is to-day too frequently made—chiefly by those who do not feel themselves called to think. Often we are told that the christological formulations of the early centuries would have filled Jesus Himself with surprise. Doubtless they would. The remark, however, raises a false question, and leads to false issues. The only *surprise* on our Lord's part that should cause us deep disquietude is, not the surprise due to the lack of omniscient foreknowledge of these matters, but that shock of surprise at the *manner* in which these issues were so frequently decided. Would not most of the historic councils have dissolved in abashment had He been present as in the days of His flesh? Even so, the facts being as they were, the Church had to set about the task of coherent interpretation of Him, whose unswerving moral fidelity and knowledge of God was the starting-point of the whole Christian movement.

The hard pedestrian road of formulation, of interpretation, was necessary then. It is no less necessary now. Reflective, coherent statement is inescapable, because we have to tread the path of our frailty and finitude. Yet, when we *see*, how inadequate are all our best endeavours! It is

then that, with Aquinas, we say, 'What I have written now seems to me as straw.'

The Christian theologian's task is not to 'prove' the Incarnation. That he can never do. None of our 'evidences' here is demonstration; as none of our 'proofs' of God is demonstration. All that, as theologian or philosopher, he can do is to seek to show that it is this interpretative hypothesis which gives meaning to the whole of human and cosmic history as known to him. This is, to use the words of Professor A. E. Taylor, 'the undemonstrated and undemonstrable conviction which gives the Christian religion its specific character' (*The Faith of a Moralist*, Vol. II., p. 125). Browning said very much the same thing to the Victorian Age in his familiar lines:

I say the acknowledgement of God in Christ,
Accepted by thy reason, solves for thee
All questions in the earth and out of it.

That the Incarnation is 'undemonstrated and undemonstrable' does not forbid its being 'accepted by thy reason.' For that which gives meaning to existence is not irrational, but in the best and deepest sense rational. To seek to show that this truest rationality belongs to the message of the Incarnation is the task of the philosophic theologian—no more, no less. Or, to put it in apostolic language, to give reasons for the faith that is in him. This, again, is just the essentially philosophic endeavour to state the message in truths that are self-evidencing.

Yet let it be frankly recognized that the source of our real beliefs is much deeper than the reasons we can give for accepting them: which explains the fact that our reasons, and theories, seldom if ever convince those whose experience and general outlook is not ours. Most of our philosophizings and theologizings are the endeavours to find reasons for what we believe on deeper and, ultimately, unanalysable grounds. We have to use our reason as best we may to test

the grounds of our conviction. Yet those grounds go deep into our whole religious heritage, and so are insusceptible of rationalist analysis. So is it with the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation. It has come to us as the most precious heritage of the whole Christian past. In it meet the loftiest experiences and profoundest reflections of Christian history. Often the Church is perplexed because she cannot give reasons she feels adequate for her beliefs. Her attempts to define and to theorize merely seem to give 'incisive statements of problems at which we unsuccessfully labour.' She reads the record of past endeavours, and the story is both her incentive and her despair. The official Chalcedonian definition is regarded by some as but representing the 'bankruptcy of Greek patristic theology,' and by others as mere 'incoherent' statement. Such judgements could be multiplied, did space and their importance permit, from modern Christian leaders and thinkers. No thinker can acquiesce in mere 'incoherence.' Not the least important task for the Church in an exacting and perplexing age, therefore, is a more coherent statement of her Incarnational faith.

And the main point here stressed is that, in our endeavour to think through these issues and to arrive at such a statement, our point of departure must be the historic Jesus, and especially His consciousness of God. The philosophic theologian who girds at the mystical element in religion cannot evade the question which here arises. Here in the Person of Jesus we are confronted by One who claimed a real intercourse with God, who spoke of a direct knowledge of God. There is here—if I may use in my own context the words spoken on his death-bed by von Hügel—something 'not . . . built up by mere human reasoning, no clever or subtle hypothesis, nothing particularly French or German or English.' Here there is an assurance, unique, harmonious, strong, and self-sufficing, of the One Great Reality, God.

C. J. WRIGHT.

Notes and Discussions

DR. ADOLF VON HARNACK ON 'THE INNER LIFE'

DURING the Great War, Harnack found time to write lengthy letters of comfort to his relatives. Many of them were addressed to his daughter, whose husband was an early victim of the struggle. Before his death, Harnack gave permission for these *Meditations on the Inner Life*¹ to be published. Dr. Martin Rade, in welcoming their issue, truly says, in *Die Christliche Welt*: 'When one lays this little book by the side of Harnack's *History of Dogma*, one can scarcely conceive that both came from the same hand. Those who lightly speak of "unbelieving professors" should carefully read these devotional studies.' Intimate friends of the eminent theologian, we are further told, did not need this volume to assure them of his fervent piety; but all rejoice to have these 'fatherly-friendly talks.' From many points of view they illustrate what Harnack himself says in one of his letters: 'Everything depends upon our being strong in the inward man.'

Dark and difficult were the days between September 1916 and August 1918, but during this distressful time thirty-one of these thirty-six letters were written. There is, however, little in them to remind the reader of the war and its alarms. The writer's sole concern is to shed the light of the gospel on hearts that are desolate and sad. The following are the only references to the war given by this scholarly historian who, as a politician, took his full share of responsibility in those days of storm and stress. On Christmas Eve, 1916, the introduction to an exposition of John i. 14, 'The Word became flesh,' &c., reads: 'This is the gospel for Christmas; it takes our thoughts beyond the beautiful children's Christmas stories to the central fact which we, with the whole of Christendom, are celebrating—with the whole of Christendom wherein this year so few lights are shining. Let us hope that, all the more, hearts will be warmed as, notwithstanding their distress and tribulation, they find consolation in the love of God.' On New Year's Day, 1917, the text chosen is 2 Tim. i. 7, 'God gave us not the spirit of fearfulness, but of power and love and discipline,' and this is the comment: 'The New Year for the third time finds us at war. . . . Our New Year's wish for the German people cannot be expressed in better words than these: God give to the Fatherland the spirit of power and love and discipline. Power without love is selfish and brutal; love without discipline is weak and emotional. But power, love, and discipline

¹ *Vom inneren Leben: Betrachtungen über Bibelworte und freie Texte*, von Adolf von Harnack. Heilbronn: Eugen Salzer. Pp. 175. M 8. 60.

together form a glorious trinity, and nothing greater can we desire for a nation.'

The message for the yet darker days of Advent, 1919, is found in Isaiah xl. 6 ff. : 'Without God all flesh is grass, and all its goodliness is as the flower of the field. . . . God has destroyed our treasure because we deemed them our highest good, and, apart from God, depended upon their continuance.' The final word to the nation, as to Judah of old, is 'Behold your God. . . . The same power which causes the grass to wither and the flower to fade ripens the fruit and makes the sun to shine upon us.' With the exception of a reference to the bravery of the men who, in spite of many perils, crossed the seas to fight for Germany, these are all the allusions to the war in these meditations, and none would deny that they are worthy of a Christian patriot.

Harnack did occasionally preach, and always effectively. The majority of these meditations are homely, heart-to-heart talks, but behind them lies homiletical skill as well as scholarly exposition. There is freshness in his treatment of familiar themes. To the question, What does Jesus teach us, in the Parable of the Leaven, concerning the working of the Kingdom of Heaven in the world? this is the reply : 'He does not say that it will work like a varnish [*Färbnis*] beneath which everything remains as it was, and there is only a conventional outside show ; He does not say that it will work like a supplement [*Zugabe*] so that there is a duplication, a new element added to, and existing alongside, man's ordinary life ; neither does He say that it will work like a corrosive [*Ätzmittel*] so that the ordinary life is destroyed and dissolved. What He does say is that it works like the leaven, which penetrates and transforms the meal of life to the last grain, but without destroying it. A slow but sure process. . . . Nothing is taken away, but nothing remains the same.'

In the conversation of our Lord with the scribe (Mark xii. 82-4), a simple, twofold division goes to the heart of the problem raised : 'In the first place, Jesus distinguishes, not only between those who belong to His kingdom and those who do not, but also between those who are near to and those who are far from His kingdom.' The unfolding of this truth yields encouragement for those who are prone to judge themselves harshly, but also warning to those who lightly pass severe judgement on their fellows. 'Secondly, why does Jesus say "Thou art not far from the Kingdom of God" to the scribe who had accepted what Jesus had described as the sum of all that is holy and good—the love of God and the love of one's neighbour ?' The reply given to this question is that Jesus had detected 'a false undertone' in the words of the scribe, when he declared that to fulfil the two commandments was 'more than all whole burnt-offerings and sacrifices.' But 'it is not only "more" ; it is everything. He who does not find, in the love of God and in the love of his neighbour, his all-inclusive duty has not yet learnt what they really mean.' Wordsworth's lines aptly illustrate the exposition :

Give all thou canst ; high Heaven rejects the love
Of slooly-calculated less or more.

No information is given concerning any particular inquiries to which these letters make reply. It must have been to meet some special difficulty that the longest letter (ten pages) was written. The title is 'Concerning Pantheism, Deism, and Theism,' and a succinct dissertation is given on these profound themes. Briefly, but most lucidly, 'materialistic pseudo-pantheism' is distinguished from higher forms of pantheism, as, e.g., 'those which ennoble man by saying that only in him does the Godhead become conscious.' At its best, however, pantheism is 'neutral as regards morality, either conceiving it as an efflorescence of the natural or dismissing it as a mere human notion.' The final appeal must be to experience. 'Pantheism has its origin in nature, deism in conscience, but Christian theism in experience . . . and secondarily in history, i.e. the religious history of mankind.'

Three 'Meditations' are based on non-biblical themes (*Freie Texte*). One is a discussion of a saying of Goethe recorded in his *Conversations with Eckermann*: 'The Christian religion has nothing to do with philosophy. . . . It needs no support from it.' Another expounds five of the sayings of Anselm Feuerbach—the first being, 'One should desire nothing from God but Himself.' Another, on 'The Unconscious, Reason, and Conscience,' comments on a lecture by Dr. Johannes Müller.

In this notice an attempt has been made to give some indication of the variety of topics treated in this volume, of which an English translation would be welcome. It was, I think, Harnack who said that every theology should be subjected to this test: Can it be preached? These choice 'Meditations' yield ample proof that—whatever may be the ultimate value of some of Harnack's critical theories—his theology could be so preached as to bring comfort in the day of adversity to the faint-hearted, strengthening them in the inward man.

J. G. TASKER.

MINISTERS' STUDY CIRCLES

KIPLING would have it that

Down to Gehenna or up to the throne,
He travels the fastest who travels alone.

Dr. Streeter tells another tale. In the Introduction to *Immortality*, itself a product of corporate study, he puts powerfully the case for the group method.

Discovery comes whenever trains of thought or pieces of information, originally separate, are seen to illuminate and explain each other. But when the things requiring to be brought together exist in different minds, this fusion is made harder or easier in exact proportion to . . . the range of contact between those minds. Hence, though much may be accomplished by the reading of books or articles by workers in different departments, conditions become more favourable if this can be supplemented by the living contact of mind with mind.

In the ensuing sentence many will recognize a transcript of their own experience :

Intellectual co-operation only achieves its greatest possibilities where its basis is enthusiasm for a common cause and personal friendship : and experience shows that the intellectual activity and receptivity of each is raised to the highest pitch when that fellowship is not in work alone and in discussion, but in jest and prayer as well—for humour and common devotion, when both are quite spontaneous, are, though in very different ways, the greatest solvents of egotism and a well-spring of fellowship and mutual understanding.

From many quarters illustrations could be drawn of the truth of that statement, but our present aim is, at the request of the editors of this REVIEW, to adduce the distinctive testimony which the *Holborn* (now merged in the *London Quarterly*) has given from 1922.

In that year Dr. Peake, who had only a short while previously become its editor, opened its columns to a discussion of the methods and aims of study circles. By 1928 the hospitality of its pages was afforded to study circle reports, passing through the hands of the present writer, which became a regular feature of the *Review*. More than that, special articles were secured from eminent contributors on suggested themes. Dr. Raven wrote on 'The Nature of God,' Dr. Grensted on 'Spiritual Healing,' Dr. Wheeler Robinson on 'The Holy Spirit.' Professor A. L. Humphries, M.A., gave a thought-provoking 'Constructive Statement of the Doctrine of the Atonement.' Dr. Peake himself, by special desire, outlined a course of study on 'Modernism and the Person of Christ,' and another on 'The Fourth Gospel.' A helpful syllabus on 'The Preacher and Psychology' was provided by the Rev. F. C. Taylor, M.A., B.D., Sociology was represented by an article by Professor E. W. Hirst, M.A., B.Sc., on 'The Teleology of the Family' and by Professor Atkinson Lee's conspectus on the subject of 'Property.' An outstanding and greatly appreciated summary, with bibliography and questionnaire, on the Sermon on the Mount came from the pen of the Rev. J. A. Findlay, M.A. The Rev. C. Philips Cape presented an indictment of Theosophy based upon first-hand knowledge of its Eastern sources derived from residence in India. The list might be extended, but these titles may serve as samples of the appetizing fare.

No attempt, however, was made to impose these topics upon the circles which were functioning here and there, but they served an admirable purpose in setting a standard and blazing a track. Gradually the broad lines emerged on which most of the Primitive Methodist circles are conducted. In happy communistic style, it is now largely the fashion to pool all the expenses and thus to make possible the attendance of men who live, isolated, at a distance from the centre, as well as those who are in populous towns. Generally a theological or philosophical book forms the basis of the morning's sessions. At the afternoon gatherings the fields of sociology and literature have been gleaned, and occasionally distinguished visitors have opened a discussion on some subject in which they have specialized. In the Darlington and Newcastle districts Retreats have been held, with encouraging results. At Grimsby, for three years in succession, a

Ministers' Quiet Day in September has been attended by representative companies, and proved of genuine value.

The whole movement has been spontaneous and entirely unacademic. Ministers engaged in ordinary circuit work have felt drawn to consult together on the fundamentals of faith or the problems of the day. Not content with the brief essay or talk which in some fraternal is the makeweight with social intercourse, busy men in their busiest season have found it profitable to use the freshest hours of a day in concerted serious attack on some great theme. First-hand contact with the surging, tumultuous world has made men eager to bring all the questionings which are thus aroused, and which clamour for attention, and to seek solution in united quest for reality. The dictum of no book is taken on authority, but all is tested by earnest reasoning and by the pragmatic criterion: Does it work?

The Archbishops' Pastoral of 1929 called the clergy to group study, and led to the various Schemes for Prayer and Study issued by the Archbishops' Advisory Committee. *A Way of Renewal*, 1931-2: *A Review of Aim and Method*, says: 'The experience of the past two years has proved that the method of group study can accomplish the double result of *enriching our knowledge and increasing our unity*.' Is not this peculiarly appropriate to the three Methodist denominations soon to become one?

Above has been set out briefly an account of study circle activity amongst Primitive Methodists. Could we hear of what has been done on similar or related lines amongst our brethren of the other two Churches? In addition—and this is of most moment and it is for this purpose that this sketch has been written—could not ways be mutually devised whereby, whilst still retaining the elasticity and spontaneity of the past, we may in the future, through the courtesy and co-operation of the editors of the *London Quarterly* and *Holborn Review*, use the pages as a medium of inspiration and exchange, and more fully enrich our knowledge and increase our unity?

W. E. FARNDALE.

FOUR NEW BOOKS ON THE BIBLE¹

THE Bible is not only the book of books, but also the book that beyond all others inspires the writing of books; in this quartette we have a varied group of works addressed to different audiences, but each seeking in some way to promote the understanding of the sacred scriptures. We are delighted that the B.B.C. has not neglected religion in drawing up its programmes, and congratulate it on securing Professor Dodd, who succeeded the late Dr. A. S. Peake

¹ *The Bible and its Background*, by C. H. Dodd, M.A., D.D. (Allen & Unwin, 2s. 6d.); *The English Bible as Literature*, by C. A. Dinwiddie (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.); *Judaism in the Greek Period*, by G. H. Box, M.A., D.D. (Oxford University Press, 4s. 6d.); *Dadda-Iddi, or the Aramaic of the Book of Daniel*, by C. Boutflower, M.A. (S.P.C.K., 2s. 6d.).

in the Rylands Chair of Biblical Exegesis at the University of Manchester, to broadcast the series of talks which are now reproduced in book form. The author has very wisely left them as he spoke them, save that he has included a few paragraphs which the exigencies of the programme time-limit compelled him to omit when they were delivered. The result is a very clear and simple introduction to the Bible expressed in terms that the most unlearned can readily understand. The marvellous characteristic of the book is the way in which the whole subject is covered, without any sense of restriction, in so brief an account. Small details are wisely ignored, but nothing essential is omitted. We hope the book will come into the hands of all Methodist Sunday-school teachers and local preachers. We note with pleasure that the Apocrypha is not neglected, but considered in its proper place in connexion with the 'Writings.' The fact that more than two-thirds of the space is devoted to the Old Testament is an eloquent commentary on the foolish idea that it is possible in any real sense to understand the New Testament if the Old Testament is regarded as something that may be relegated to the region of things that have comparatively slight importance. If, as we hope, a second edition is called for, one or two slightly awkward sentences, such as that divided between pp. 26 and 27, might perhaps be revised.

Mr. Dinsmore's book—in many ways a typically American production—has, of course, a very different objective from that of Professor Dodd. He is by no means uninterested in the religious value of the Bible, but is concerned here to exhibit its supreme excellence as a piece of literature, which, he urges, the religious associations often make it difficult for the general reader to appreciate. He divides his study into three parts, the first of which is devoted to the 'Genius and Discipline of the Hebrew People.' He asks the question how it came about that a piece of literature so great as the Hebrew Scriptures was produced by a people in other respects so insignificant. The answer he finds partly in the geographical situation, which made 'religion and its experience the only outlet for the nation's genius.' We are not quite sure whether his thesis that Israel was the first nation to outgrow the primitive mind ought not to be stated less absolutely, but he is on sure ground in his contrast between the Greek idea, 'Know thyself,' and the Hebrew idea, 'Know thy God.' Perhaps the best section in this part of the discussion is that dealing with the literary qualities of the Hebrew mind. Mr. Dinsmore contends, with some justification, that the English Bible is a finer piece of literature than the originals which it translates. In this respect he finds the modern translations most disappointing.

Part two is devoted to the literary values of the Old Testament books. The histories are compared with those of Greece, and the purposes in the minds of their authors considered. The greatest space in this section is given to the poetical books. A useful chapter deals with the forms of Hebrew poetry. In comparison, the thirty-four pages in which the prophets are discussed seem rather inadequate, and within them the proportions are not well adjusted. Amos is

hardly entitled to three times as much space as that allowed to Jeremiah. Some of the judgements expressed would certainly be challenged by many scholars. Did Hosea really 'lack the fire, the vivid, concrete imagination, the rhythm of strong emotion, which characterized his predecessor' Amos? Seeing that Professor Torrey is thanked for reading the proof of the book, we turned with interest to those parts of the subject in which Torrey's views are most unorthodox to discover how far the author had been influenced by them. He mentions, without much enthusiasm, the endeavour of Torrey to date Isa. xxxiv.-lxvi. to 400 B.C., but ignores the much weightier argument of his proof-reader against the generally accepted date of Ezekiel. His standpoint on the subject of the prophetic consciousness may be deduced from his sentence, 'The Greeks and Romans might read the will of God in the entrails of animals: the prophets heard his voice in what was best in their own souls.' In his treatment of the Humanists of Israel perhaps the most interesting item is his appreciation of Ecclesiastes. That Mr. Dinmore should rank the book as first-class literature is not surprising, but it is rather startling that he should find it 'very comforting.'

To the literature of the New Testament less than a sixth part of the book is allotted, which seems, even granting that, regarded as literature merely, the Old Testament is easily the greater, not quite an adequate proportion. But the treatment is fresh and stimulating, the chapters on the Gospels and 'The Sayings of Jesus as Literature' being among the best in the book. Few readers will agree with all the verdicts passed by Mr. Dinmore; some will regret that in such a book he does not disdain to use such an expression as 'to minutely analyse'; but he has written with knowledge and enthusiasm, and the result is a useful book.

The volume by Canon Box is the fifth in the Old Testament section of that splendid production of the Oxford Press—*The Clarendon Bible*. The passages selected for treatment are taken from Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Isaiah, Joel, Jonah, Habakkuk, Zechariah, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, and 1 Maccabees, and the period covered is 800-68 B.C. The seventy-six pages of introduction show everywhere the author's complete mastery of his material, and are an excellent example of the art that compresses information into a limited space without reducing the matter to the nature of a catalogue. They furnish a fine background for the rest of the book, and a study of them would enable the reader to appreciate the New Testament with greater understanding. In this respect the sections dealing with the rise of the Pharisees and the Jewish Diaspora are specially useful. Canon Box is favourably impressed by the argument for assigning Joel to the age of Alexander, though he does not definitely accept it. We note that he appears to regard the Yahweh speeches as no part of the original Job, a position which, despite the eloquent statement of the contrary view by many eminent scholars, we are disposed to accept without hesitation. The notes are very good: one's only regret is that limitations of space prevent them

from being quite so full as might have been wished. But, having in view the special class of readers for whom the *Clarendon Bible* is avowedly prepared, there may be something to be said for avoiding too much detail in any case. We are glad to see the place of the Apocrypha recognized, and should be pleased to find that the readers of this book have been tempted by the glimpses of that fascinating country here provided to make further excursions into its territory.

The production of the book leaves nothing to be desired. Paper and type are excellent. The illustrations are numerous, gathered from many sources—including William Blake—and really help to an understanding of the period. No teacher of Scripture, whether from the pulpit or the desk, should neglect this fine volume, for which our thanks are sincerely tendered to its author.

Mr. Boutflower's book is one which must inevitably make its appeal only to specialists in the Semitic languages, in spite of its author's intention to make it useful to those who have but a moderate acquaintance with Hebrew. It is an attempt to rebut the argument—prominently associated with the names of Rowley and Driver—that the Aramaic of Daniel is such that the book must be brought down several centuries later than its traditional date. Mr. Boutflower has gathered together much useful material, and stated his case well. Whether the inferences which he draws from his facts are sound is a matter upon which only specialists can pronounce, and we shall await with interest the comments of Driver and Rowley on the case. In one reader's mind, at least, all Mr. Boutflower's painstaking work lies under suspicion because of his avowed object—the demonstration of traditional dates. But he always writes with sincerity, and his work is entitled to respect. It is perhaps not without significance that the frontispiece to the book is an excellent photograph of the 'Tomb of Daniel.'

W. L. WARDLE.

Religion: Its Basis and Development. By H. Montague Dale, B.D. (Allenson 5s.) Religion demands our study because of its prevalence, persistence and power. Each of these subjects is opened up in a impressive way and the origin and evolution of religion are discussed. Its influence on art, law, and especially on character and conduct, furnish material for two interesting chapters, and the future of religion is shown to rest on those who will be willing to dedicate their entire personality in love to God and man. It is a book with a much needed message.

Recent Literature

THEOLOGY AND APOLOGETICS

The Teaching of Jesus. By T. M. Manson, M.A. (Cambridge University Press. 15s.)

WITH this book Mr. Manson, formerly tutor at Westminster College, Cambridge, takes his place among the leading writers of our day on New Testament subjects. He has been thoroughly equipped for his high task. We notice a competence in subjects relating to the philosophy of religion, as well as a mastery of linguistic questions. Not the least merit of the book is to be found in the discussions of the possible Aramaic originals of various difficult sayings of Jesus. But more impressive still is the religious insight of the writer, which gives him an originality and a power in handling his perplexing theme. Every one who reads Schweitzer should read this book also, and all students of New Testament theology will find it valuable. Mr. Manson takes the critical conclusions of Canon Streeter quite seriously. He does not share the comparative scepticism of leading Cambridge scholars as to the 'Four-document hypothesis.' Building on these foundations, he endeavours to prove two main propositions: one with regard to the form, and the other with regard to the content, of the teaching. First, he maintains that the form in which the teaching is delivered is determined by two factors: the kind of audience addressed and the period in the ministry. He distinguishes three classes of sayings: those addressed to the disciples, those spoken to the general public, and polemical utterances. Working from this distinction, he explains the main problem of the parables (Mark iv.) in a far more satisfactory way than has been customary since Jülicher's classical work. The other factor which determines the form of the teaching is the period in the ministry. Here Mr. Manson's method is interesting, even if precarious. He finds in Peter's confession 'the watershed of the gospel history,' and, from an examination of important words and phrases, concludes that Mark gives the teaching of Jesus in something very like the original order.

The second main proposition which Mr. Manson sets out to demonstrate is that the key to the contents of the teaching is the prophetic notion of the Remnant. He holds that the phrase 'the Son of Man' represents the formulation by Jesus in His own mind of the Remnant ideal, and that, in fact, He is the Son of Man by embodying that ideal in His own person. In the course of Mr. Manson's argument we observe that he grapples bravely with the central difficulty of all interpretation of the Gospels: What does 'the Kingdom' mean?

In its essence, it is 'the Reign of God, a personal relation between God and the individual.' Before Caesarea Philippi, Jesus speaks of the Kingdom as something which is coming. After Caesarea Philippi, it is something into which He calls men to 'enter' or to 'receive.' Great stress is laid—perhaps greater stress than the words can really carry—on the actual phrases used. And he reaches the conclusion that Jesus held that the Kingdom had come in some real sense during His own ministry. 'Further, we may suppose that the coming of the Kingdom is to be identified with one or other of the outstanding events which mark the turning-point alike in the teaching and the ministry. The most plausible conjecture will be that which equates the coming of the Kingdom with Peter's confession: "Thou art the Messiah." This great saying . . . was, in fact, the recognition of the Kingdom in the person of Jesus; and with that recognition the Kingdom could be said to have come.'

This theory demands attention. There are many difficulties in its way. The stress upon Peter's confession means that the evident connexion for the mind of our Lord between the Cross and the Kingdom in the last days of His earthly life is obscured, or even ignored, if the Kingdom has already come. The theory is open to many of the objections which have recently been raised against regarding the Marcan outline as strictly chronological. The linguistic evidence needs further sifting before the conclusions which Mr. Manson draws can be accepted. But, at all events, the book does take account of certain elements in the teaching of our Lord which are essential. It does place His personality in the foreground, and recognize that for Him, as for His followers, communion with God was the supreme reality both in this life and beyond. It denies that the idea of forcing the coming of the Kingdom (a temptation which had already been rejected in advance at the outset of His ministry) was the dominant motive in His mind during the last days. And the connexion between the great doctrine of the Remnant and our Lord's conception of His own mission is worked out in a coherent and masterly fashion. Altogether, the author, is to be congratulated on a real achievement, and the book should be widely read.

Religion, Morals, and the Intellect. By F. E. Pollard, M.A. (Allen & Unwin. 5s.)

Mr. H. G. Wood compares his friend's book to John Morley's *On Compromise*, which came as a challenge and a tonic to young men of his own generation. It is a plea for a reasonable religion which approaches the indubitable facts in common human experience with that power of valuation and integration with which the mind or soul is endowed and thus enters 'into possession of something of that spirit of all good which brings peace and power, and commands our humble worship and loyal service.' Mr. Pollard refuses to believe that religion and the rational are antagonistic, and declines to leave rationalism to the anti-religious. We have within ourselves a faculty

of self-judgement, and are conscious of unrealized resources of power. To feel that this inward power is due to a person 'in whose mind the supreme values have their objective existence, and by the unifying power of reason to identify the spirit of life with the Creator or Sustainer of the universe, will help to identify God with all the workings of good in the daily lives of men.' That is the end of this suggestive line of reasoning, and it will really help those who recognize what the inspiring power and profound insight of Jesus means to the race and the individual, and see that the truth of the laws of life lies in no man's authority, but in the nature of reality. This gives them a new and rational validity, and invests reality with fresh meaning and character.

The Finality of Christ. By S. B. John. (Kingsgate Press. 5s.)

Mr. John is a Baptist minister whose aim, to quote his own words, is 'to present Jesus Christ as the focus of all thought and of all life.' The book is the fruit of much thought and study, and is full of suggestions which the reader can follow further for himself. There is a brief outline of the leading non-Christian faiths, and the chapters on 'Christ, the Truth' provide excellent summaries of the fundamental ideas of many non-Christian systems. The weakest section, perhaps, is that in which the writer attempts to describe the achievement of Christ, since the space allowed is quite adequate. But one is amazed that he has crowded into this book so much solid thought, and has written in such an attractive style, that the reader experiences no sense of weariness from the first to the last page. Professor Chance, in his foreword, declares that 'this is an admirable book, well conceived, well planned, and well worked out,' and we feel that most of those who read the volume will readily endorse this statement.

The Psalms. A Revised Translation. By F. H. Wales, B.D. (Humphrey Milford. 6s.)

The first shilling part of this translation appeared three years ago, and each of the five parts increased our interest in the work. It is now gathered into one volume, with certain revisions suggested by friends and reviewers. Mr. Wales has aimed at a plain and rhythmical expression of the sense, severely shunning the freedom of paraphrase. The form of the Hebrew is reproduced as far as possible in the printed text and adds much to the effectiveness. The translator has had no easy task, but he has produced a version which will be used, both by students and devotional readers, with growing appreciation. A brief note on each Psalm, given at the end of the volume, is a very happy new feature.

Mishnah Megillah. Edited by Joseph Rabinowitz, B.A., Ph.D. (Oxford University Press. 10s. 6d.)

The Mishnah formed the subject of study in Babylonia and Palestine next to the Scriptures, but it is only with the renaissance of Jewish

learning in the last hundred years that a scientific method of approach has been evolved. A critical edition of the complete text is greatly needed; and this work aims at a fuller elucidation of one of the most important treatises of the Mishnah bearing upon the liturgy of the synagogue. It prescribes detailed regulations for the celebration of the Feast of Purim, for the reading and writing of the Scroll of Esther, and sheds light on the origin and development of the readings of the Law in the synagogue. Megillah is the name of the Book of Esther and means a scroll. This is the writer's first contribution to rabbinic study, and his introduction describes the rules laid down for the reading of the Megillah and the rites and customs of Purim. It was a time of extreme joy when friends exchanged gifts of foodstuffs and various dainties. The Hebrew text is given on one page, with the translation opposite, and the scholarly notes will be of great service to scholars. It is certainly a notable entrance on this field of study.

Christian Worship. By Howard H. Brinton, B.A. (Allen & Unwin. 1s. 6d.)

This Swarthmore Lecture for 1931 applies what is essentially Boehme's philosophy, of which Mr. Brinton has given a study in *The Mystic Will*, to the present situation in the sphere of worship. He easily shows how worship is languishing to-day, and how, in Protestantism at least, this fact is bound up with the mechanistic civilization of the West. In Catholicism there is still preserved, through the sacraments, some sense of mystery and power in worship, but this is so only intermittently. There is need for a vital and creative attitude which ensures continuous and progressive union with God. This is attainable in the Quaker form of worship, improved by recent methods of group life, and expressed in social activities. Perhaps (it is hinted) this is really the specially American contribution to religion, and the likely form of its future religious experience. Such religions would be organic, as compared with more or less mechanical religion of Protestant and Catholic. The world is getting tired of mechanism, and is longing for vitality again. Opinions like these are worth pondering, and it may be very true that in some such way religion will be reborn. One can only hope that the ordinary Quaker service will be enriched by elements such as Boehme provides—a deep and thorough philosophy and a glowing poetical imagination. Mr. Brinton's book is an excellent contribution to that end.

The Price of Providence. By the Rev. Tom Sykes. *The Divine Urge.* By the Rev. H. Ingham, D.D. *Reflections on the Devotional Life.* By the Rev. Leonard Newby. *The Friendship of Jesus.* By the Rev. R. W. Thompson, M.A., B.D. *A Sevenfold Claim.* By the Rev. G. W. Walker, M.A., B.D. (Stockwell. 2s. 6d. each.) The congregations who first hear these sermons as spoken addresses are to be congratulated. There are a few places where their appeal

seems to have lost a little of its edge by the revision for the printed page, but not many. They would be good to hear, and most of them are good to read—which is a severe test. They differ in their qualities. The volumes by Mr. Ingham, Mr. Newby, and Mr. Walker do not examine the assumptions of our Christian faith, but do deal forcefully with their spiritual implications. The sermons of Mr. Thompson and Mr. Sykes have in them many echoes of the questions asked by those whose faith is a quest rather than a creed. Mr. Sykes's sermon on 'The Heroism of Jesus' is a fine example of the modern spirit touched with spiritual vision and understanding. We need both kinds of addresses, and here we have them. The wrappers have a portrait of the preacher in each case.

The Prayer of Sonship, by B. F. Simpson, Vicar of St. Peter's, Cranley Gardens, is the Lenten book which the Bishop of London commends as an aid to a stronger and more reasonable faith. It is a study of the Lord's Prayer which seeks to give a touch of freshness to familiar themes, and relate to contemporary life what is the most familiar thing in our religion, used in every service. Mr. Simpson deals with the prayer as an anthem on Sonship illustrated by our Lord's life, and with the minor cadence of the parable of the prodigal son woven into the melody. He describes the prayer as the Son's Charter, worship, approval of His Father's purpose, obedience, bodily and spiritual needs of the Son's future. That is a suggestive outline, and the chapters are rich in matter for meditation. (Longmans & Co.)—*Members of Christ*, by Bernard Clements (Longmans, 2s. 6d.), contains four papers on the human race as the Mystical Body of God, through which He manifests Himself to the world. Then comes a sermon preached on 'The Mother of my Lord,' who 'hears me and prays for me.' This is continued in 'Juxta Crucem' and followed by another sermon 'The Merchantman in Africa' preached in Westminster Abbey which represents Christ as the merchant and we as the pearls. Illustrations are given from the Preacher's five years' work in the Diocese of Accra.

The Church and English Life. By the Right Rev. Bertram Pollock, D.D., K.C.V.O. (Longmans & Co. 2s. 6d., 4s. 6d.) The Bishop of Norwich has struck out a new line in this volume of sermons. They are arranged in four groups: The Church and the Nation; The English Church: Youth and Education; Doctrine in the English Church; Worship. Dr. Pollock's experience as Master of Wellington College give special weight to his counsels to boys and girls and to their parents. His sermons on Christian Patriotism, The Double Tradition of the East Anglian Church and on doctrine and worship are marked by evangelical force and practical wisdom. The sermons are pleasant to read and will be welcomed in the bishop's own diocese and far beyond it.

HISTORY, BIOGRAPHY, TRAVEL

Wanderings. By Arthur Symons. (Dent & Sons. 8s. 6d.)

THE wanderings are arranged in four groups : in France ; in other lands ; further wanderings in France ; at home. It is no mean education to ramble over Europe in such company. Mr. Symons's eyes are everywhere. He sees the beauty of nature ; he delights in old buildings ; he is steeped in the local history, and he is never blind to the beauty of such peasants as the far-famed women of Arles. He describes his love of exploring cities by night : ' Certain cities—Rome, Seville, Venice—how I have loved them, what a delight it was to me merely to be alive and living in them, and what a delight it is to me to think of them, to imagine myself in their streets and on their waters.' That describes the feeling these *Wanderings* awake in a reader. We are at his side, looking on lovely scenes of which he points out the charm. Semur, as he approached from Avallon, was ' made majestic with its fortifications, long, red-tiled towers, donjons ; a city I had never dreamed of nor imagined, that shone as if it flamed.' Its situation is one of the most striking and startling that can be imagined, as the exquisite illustration by G. E. Chambers helps us to see with our own eyes. Mr. Symons is a prose poet, and every touch adds to the charm of his descriptions. He starts at La Chaise-Dieu and takes us to Arles and Provençal scenes which are linked to Mistral. Then we are in Paris with many ' unspiritual adventures.' A few pages further on we read the notes on Italy, and, after many further French wanderings, we end our pilgrimage in Kent and Cornwall. It is exquisite work, and the dates attached to the sketches help us to understand the *Wanderlust* of the writer and in a happy sense to share it. The eight full-page illustrations are real works of art.

The Early Age of Greece. By Sir William Ridgeway. Vol. II. Edited by A. S. F. Gow and D. S. Robertson. (Cambridge University Press. 80s.)

The first volume of this work was printed in 1901, and the appearance of the second was probably held back by Sir Arthur Evans's epoch-making discoveries in Crete which had only lately begun. It was essential for Ridgeway to form some estimate of their bearing on his own theory before committing himself further. He died in 1926, leaving his work incomplete. It has been a heavy task for his two literary executors to prepare it for publication. The author had revised it in proof, but all references and quotations had to be verified, a large mass of material examined and destroyed. It has chapters on ' Kinship and Marriage ' ; ' Murder and Homicide ' ; ' Fetish, Totem, and Ancestors ' ; and a final chapter on ' Ireland in the Heroic Age ' which departs from the general theme, but shows that

Ridgeway's scheme was expanding into an *Early Age of Europe*. Mr. A. J. B. Wace, Director of the British School at Athens, has written an introduction, which shows how later research confirms Ridgeway's view of the composite nature of the Greek race and dwells on the tremendous influence which Ridgeway's personality and methods exercised on his students. 'He taught them not to be satisfied with superficial conclusions, but to probe deeply into the matter in hand and strip off the layers to reveal the kernel of truth within. They learnt never to be content with what any one else had written on a subject, but to go back as far as possible to the first authority.' Those were the principles on which he worked, as these pages prove. The chapter on 'Kinship and Marriage' points out that the majority of ghosts seen by Odysseus in the realms of Hades and Persephone were those of women. Descent may have been traced in these early days through females, rather than through males. But, in the case of all the Achaean princes, succession from father to son seems to have been the unvarying rule. The social life of primitive Greece is seen surviving at Sparta, in classical times in the simple and frugal lives of the citizens, in the absence of gold and silver, and in the great freedom and influence allowed to women. In the chapter on 'Murder and Homicide' we see that the laws of Athens forbade the kindred of any one who had been deliberately slain to accept any compensation from the murderer, or to forgive him on any pretext whatever. Dr. Leaf's views on blood feuds are controverted in some important aspects. The custom and law of blood revenge is discussed at length. The chapter on 'Fetish, Totem, and Ancestors' is of special interest. The mass of Greeks in classical times had strong faith in the efficacy of sympathetic magic. The green jasper was held in special respect because it was believed that Dionysius would load with grapes the vines of him who used that gem when sacrificing on behalf of his vineyard. Spears were worshipped as immortal images, and therefore were added to the images of the gods. Animal worship seems to have existed in some parts of Greece down to the Christian era. Plato's doctrine that the soul had three parts, two of which did not survive the body, was only a modification of a very primitive belief among the Aegean peoples. The chapter on Ireland, with its illustrations of weapons and ornaments, is of extraordinary interest. The tales which date back from the Viking period have a substantial nucleus of ethnological fact. The first settlers seem to have come from south-west Europe, and the dark-complexioned race, which forms the great majority of the Irish population, belongs to this southern stock.

Three Houses. By Angela Thirkell. (H. Milford. 6s.)

The three houses are the Grange in Fulham, the town house of Burne-Jones; 27 Young Street, Kensington, where his daughter, Mrs. Mackail, lived next to the Greyhound; and North End House, Rottingdean, where Mrs. Thirkell spent many a rapturous holiday with her grandparents, Sir Edward and Lady Burne-Jones. We have

enjoyed every page of her record. The home life at Rottingdean, with Rudyard Kipling romping with his children, and Angela and her brother, and the fearful annoyance caused by trippers who seemed lost to all manners, stand out vividly. More than once Mrs. Kipling had to ask a kneeling crowd of sightseers to move aside and let her go into her own house. There is much about Philip Burne-Jones that we are glad to know, and about the Ridsdales, Mrs. Stanley Baldwin's family at Rottingdean. The children's escapades, their hours in the church, where the great archangel windows were the artist's memorial of his daughter's wedding, the morning procession to the beach, with nurses, perambulators, and children, and little scenes of village life make up a book which will fascinate lovers of Burne-Jones and Kipling. It is wonderful how the details have imprinted themselves on Mrs. Thirkell's memory, and in her record they lose nothing of their vivid interest.

More from the Primateval Forest. By Albert Schweitzer.
(A. & C. Black. 6s.)

This is a thrilling record drawn up from letters sent by Dr. Schweitzer to friends of his work. The translator owes much to Mrs. Russell, who, during a long stay at Lambarene, was a great helper to the doctor by her gift of ordering and controlling the community. His troubles as a builder are graphically described, and it was a mighty relief when iron roofs replaced the stitched raphia leaves. The natives showed few tangible proofs of gratitude and had to be watched at every turn lest they should undo all the benefits of hospital treatment by their disregard of instructions. Twenty injections for sleeping sickness have often to be performed in a day, and many trials have often to be made before the needle can find its way through skin which has almost become a coat of mail. One patient waits for the death of another in order to have the use of his mosquito-net and blanket. Hernia and elephantiasis are common in the forest district. One young native came to the hospital with a tumour weighing 72 lb. He had actually used it as a cushion to sit on. The removal of it took five hours, and the three doctors found the mere handling of it a tax on their strength. Another patient gave the people of his village a fright when he returned from hospital after the removal of a huge tumour, with jaunty steps and looking quite rejuvenated. They thought it was his ghost, and scattered in all directions. The struggle with famine, disease, and accident helps us to understand the heroic work which Dr. Schweitzer and his colleagues are carrying on at Lambarene, and sixteen pages of photographs add much to the impressiveness of the record.

Letters to John Bull and Others. By Robert the Peeler.
(Williams & Norgate. 2s. 6d.; cloth, 3s. 6d.)

The idea that lies behind these letters is the policing of the world to save it from a war that would destroy all life and civilization. Science

has given us new weapons which emerged from a war of machinery. 'You can rule the machine or the machine can rule you. You can't have it both ways. Choose which you will—co-operation or competition, an International Police Force or national armaments, progress or annihilation.' John Bull's island has been a source of real protection in the past; it does not follow that it will be so in the future. The world has seen nothing like his empire, and now it has become a League whose main object is the suppression of war and the enthronement of justice. The letters to France, Germany, and America are full of home truths and show a grasp of the situation which made war and still endangers peace. The safeguard for which the writer pleads is an International Force, which shall police the world. The letters are intensely interesting and make a powerful appeal, not only to John Bull, but to all Europe and America as well. Mendoza's illustrations certainly catch the spirit of the book and deepen the impression it makes on a reader.

Aquila and Onkelos. By A. E. Silverstone, M.A., Ph.D. (Manchester: The University Press. 12s. 6d. net.)

This is an interesting and valuable book. Briefly put, its purpose is to show that the 'Onkelos' to whom is attributed an Aramaic version of the Pentateuch, and about whom so little was known that many disbelieved in his existence, is none other than the Aquila who made the Greek version of the Old Testament. So far as we can see, Dr. Silverstone has made out a very strong case for his theory. We cannot do better than borrow from his introduction the skeleton of his argument. First he shows that stories about Onkelos in Midrashic literature find parallels in similar stories related of Akylas in the Jerusalem Talmud and Midrashim. Akylas is shown to be a spelling variant for Onkelos, and Akylas to be identical with Aquila, and to have been the author of the Targum in question. The identification is reinforced by comparison of the Greek version of Aquila with the Aramaic of Onkelos, in the course of which the two translations are shown to have common characteristics peculiar to themselves. The theoretically possible alternative explanation of the facts, namely that Onkelos—who is, according to the received opinion, of much later date than Aquila—may simply have imitated Aquila's style, is ruled out by proving that Onkelos was, like Aquila, a disciple of Akiba. This can only mean that the two are one. The case for the early date of Onkelos is based on a proof that his version is earlier than, and an influence upon, the Peshitta. This good piece of research is described as the first of a Semitic Language Series: if its successors are of equal merit, the University of Manchester will earn the gratitude of Semitic scholars.

The Passion of SS. Perpetua and Felicity. By W. H. Shewring. (Sheed & Ward. 8s. 6d.)

This is an English version accompanying the Latin text of one of the

most moving documents of early Christianity. The martyrs, Perpetua and Felicity, with their companions, died a cruel death in the amphitheatre at Carthage in A.D. 208. Perpetua was a member of an illustrious family; Felicity was a slave, perhaps in her household, together with Revocatus, Secundulus, and Saturninus, who were catechumens, and Satorius, who had been the means of their conversion, of his own will joined the other prisoners on their arrest. There is a short preface by an editor who, on good grounds, is held to be Tertullian: certainly the Latin style is in favour of this hypothesis; but the vision of Perpetua and the story of her imprisonment may well be authentic records in her own hand, while the vision of Satorius is given as his own narrative.

The best available text for English students has been that of Armitage Robinson in the *Cambridge Text and Studies*; but this beautifully printed and produced little volume is an excellent and convenient text for the average reader. The translation is well done, and the translator has added four sermons by St. Augustine in honour of the martyrs, Perpetua and Felicity. The editor is a scholar, who places his readers under obligation to his good taste and accuracy. One could wish for many more such texts of early Christian literature with original and translation together, produced in a form so attractive. The story itself has an almost overpowering effect on the reader, who will readily respond to St. Augustine's comment: 'He conquered in them who lived in them, so that they that lived not unto themselves, but unto Him, in death itself died not.'

A Handbook of Classical Mythology. By George Howe and G. A. Harrer. (Allen & Unwin. 6s. net.)

This is an American book which the publishers are issuing in this country, and the printing is characteristically clear. We have tested its contents at a number of points, and found the results satisfactory. Naturally the information given is brief, for a vast number of entries have to be covered; but the ordinary reader who wants a handy book to which he may turn for explanation of such references to classical mythology as he may encounter will find the book very useful. The various names are broken up into syllables, and the accented syllable is marked, in order to give some guidance in the matter of pronunciation.

Highways and Byways in Gloucestershire. By Edward Hutton, with Illustrations by Hugh Thompson. (Macmillan & Co. 7s. 6d.) Cirencester was the Roman doorway into Gloucestershire and the view from Birdlip ten miles westward over the Cotswolds shows the whole character of the country at a glance. The town held the easiest natural passage through the hills which were a real barrier rising to 700 and even 1100 feet. The Roman Corinium, whose site Cirencester covers, had walls two miles in length. It was larger than any other Roman

town in Britain except London. It had four gates the position of which cannot now be certainly traced. No one would dream of such a past for the picturesque town of old low houses and narrow winding streets. It fills the first chapter of this volume and Mr. Hutton makes us understand why he always returns to it with pleasure. Kempford is one of the loveliest of villages, enshrined in trees and flowers. Lechlade is charming with the old houses on its outskirts and Butler's Court, a perfect English house. Gloucester has a chapter to itself which brings out the glory of its cathedral, though we miss Robert Raikes and George Whitefield. Bristol transcends the county, as one of the gateways to England itself, once indeed the greatest of them. Cheltenham combines ancient history with modern attractions. The Forest of Dean with its vast woodlands traversed by most beautiful drives and woodland paths is a thing apart with its strangeness and stillness. Stow-on-the-Wold, the highest town in the Cotswolds, seems to look down on everything. The Fosse Way ran right through its market-place which was larger in the days when the wool of the Cotswold sheep furnished wealth to build the great Perpendicular churches in all these towns. Mr. Hutton writes from close familiarity with the county and he makes its past and its present spread out before our eyes. Hugh Thompson's choice illustrations are an outstanding feature of the *Highways and Byways* and the quiet beauty of the Abbey Hospital Gateway at Cirencester, the interior of Elkstone Church, the streets and the great Cathedrals add constant charm to these pages.

The Ecclesiastical History of Essex under the Long Parliament and the Commonwealth. By Harold Smith, D.D. (Benham & Co.) This is a county history prepared with great care and presenting a picture of religious life which is of unusual interest. A number of Lollards were discovered in Essex in 1528 and it supplied a large proportion of the victims of the Marian persecution. The Puritan character of the clergy under the Stuarts is shown by many lists. Burkitt, the commentator, was Vicar of Dedham. John Rogers had held the living from 1605-1686. Important information is given about *Eikon Basilike* and the diary of Ralph Josselin, Vicar of Earls Colne, 1640-88, furnishes much valuable material. He regards Laud as the 'grand enemy of the power of godliness, that great stickler for all outward pompe in the service of God.' Great pains have been taken to give full particulars of the Essex clergy who were ejected in 1660 and 1662. The volume indeed is a mine of information which students of the period will find full of treasure. It has some good illustrations and abounds in lively details.

GENERAL

A Study in Aesthetics. By Louis Arnaud Reid, M.A., Ph.D.
(Allen & Unwin. 15s.)

It is a healthy sign that the theory of aesthetics is being maintained, and, indeed, increased, when the younger men venture to write text-books upon the subject. Since Mr. Clive Bell wrote his little masterpiece on art, others have rounded out his or a similar thesis into a comprehensive theory. Among these is Mr. Reid, who unfolds the implications of the doctrine that beauty is perfect expressiveness, in a book which shows wide reading and a varied aesthetic experience. The main principle is applied to sensuous, and then to imaginal, material; after which there is a consideration of the work of art, of beauty in its relations to truth and morality, of the blending of various forms of art, of the kinds of beauty, and finally of the enigma of natural beauty. In the course of this treatment most of the ordinary questions of aesthetics are varied and dealt with in a clear and capable manner, though the handling of the deeper subjects is somewhat desultory. Mr. Reid seems to have knit his general theories and his aesthetic experience imperfectly together; in particular, it is hard to see what his general theory of value has to do with the values which the artist talks about. And the whole exposition is rather thin and long drawn out. However, the book will be found an excellent introduction to the more recent views of the nature of beauty, and will serve to stimulate thought upon this important subject.

The Structure of Thought. By Ludwig Fischer. (Allen & Unwin. 16s.)

Mr. W. H. Johnson, after helping to translate Hegel's *Greater Logic*, has added to our obligations by rendering Ludwig Fischer's valuable book into vigorous and precise English. The work is described as a philosophy of philosophies, and there can be no question of the importance of such an attempt to show what is common to all philosophies of the past, and, indeed, what is the natural structure of thought in all systems whatever. Hegel is the great exemplar of an enterprise of this sort, and many have supposed that he had achieved permanent success. Mr. Fischer, however, shows that a more simple and direct analysis is possible than Hegel attained, and gives an outline of his own view, together with a critical comparison of the chief systems of Western thought. It is impossible to discuss this outline here, as it is highly technical and difficult and suffers greatly from condensation. The study of other systems is highly illuminating, and affords hope that the mighty maze of European philosophy may be found to have a simple plan. Particularly interesting is the way in which Fischer connects his discoveries with modern views of relativity, so that various systems are found to be saying the same

thing, though in different ways and from various points of view. It is our belief that he is on the right lines, though without a study of his other and fuller books it is hard to be certain of this. It is much to be desired that Mr. Johnson should put us further in his debt by translating his author's *Wirklichkeit, Wahrheit, and Wissen*.

Civilization as Divine Superman. By Alexander Raven. (Williams & Norgate. 12s. 6d.)

The sub-title describes this work as 'A Superorganic Philosophy of History.' It describes civilization as a natural, if super, organism. It is the true 'superman' towards whom modern philosophy has been tending ever since Darwin propounded his principle of evolutionary advance in biology. Civilization is the result of human co-operation, and is hence in itself the actual superman whose immense powers are used by modern democracy for the enrichment and indulgence of the people. Mr. Raven pursues his theme in the political, economic, social, language, religious, and artistic circles. He finds in religion the most striking proof of a superman, for the existence of a higher being is an excellent explanation of the religious instinct.

The Aeneid of Virgil. Translated by Frank Richards, M.A. (Murray. 6s.)

In his translation of the *Aeneid*, of which a cheap edition calls for a cordial welcome, Mr. Frank Richards has achieved praiseworthy success. His experiment of rendering the original line for line in blank verse might appear at first sight to be a forlorn hope. The perils are obvious: something almost inevitably has to be omitted in the rendering, and compression necessitates a large proportion of English monosyllables as compared with the richer variation and dactylic rhythm of the Latin line. Although the translator does not slavishly follow the Latin order, and re-arranges the lines, the difficulty of reproducing a six-footed Latin line in a five-footed English, or matching, as he puts it, ten English syllables against the fifteen of the Latin, is exacting. In English a monosyllabic line is often impressive, but it loses its poetic effect by repetition. Milton, of course, is the supreme model, and his verse owes its charm to lines like

Thick as autumnal leaves that strow the brooks
In Vallombrosa . . .

where relief is given by the sonority of the place name. We cannot imagine Milton attempting to render Virgil line for line without breaking through his limits—some expansion must be permitted, though not to the exuberant extent of Dryden's version—and always there remains the problem of putting into English Virgil's topographical, geographical, and other terms without overloading the line and leaving the reader cold.

Yet the line-for-line method has its uses, and, within his self-imposed canon, Mr. Richards has produced a faithful and pleasing rendering. He has also given the reader, in eighty pages, an admirable introduction to the making and meaning of the greatest of Latin

epics, under various aspects: patriotic, religious, and romantic. We regret that he could not see his way to adopt the reading followed by Mackail in the phrase expressive of the genius of imperial Rome: *pacisque imponere morem*, rendered 'impose the law of peace.' This suggests a peace secured by the sheer weight of authority, whereas the other reading (which is found in the best MSS.)—*pacique imponere morem*—is to be preferred, inasmuch as the building up of character on peace expresses a nobler ideal which, if correct, shows Rome at her best.

Disarmament and Security since Locarno, 1925-31. By John W. Wheeler-Bennett. (Allen & Unwin. 12s. 6d.)

In 1924 Mr. Bennett founded the Information Service on International Affairs, and since 1928 has edited the annual volume of *Documents on International Affairs*. He here supplies the background of the Disarmament Conference which met in February. The whole course of the movement from Versailles to Locarno, with the Preparatory Commission and the Conferences on Disarmament, is given with a fullness of detail which makes the volume indispensable for those who take part in this great battle against war. The course of events in Europe in 1931 is clearly traced in this important survey.

The Child. By Rabindranath Tagore. (Allen & Unwin. 2s. 6d.)

The poem opens with a world in darkness, out of which appears the Man of Faith with his cry: 'Brothers, despair not, for man is great.' He is unheeded till dawn arises and all the world streams after him on pilgrimage.

Some walk, some ride on camels, horses, and elephants,
On chariots with banners vying with the clouds of dawn;
The priests of all creeds burn incense, chanting verses as they go.

Monarchs, beggars, mothers, maidens, brides, children—all swell the throng. But the way is rough and long, and the Man of Faith perishes in a fury of destruction. Death gives him new power, and with 'Victory to the Victim' they move onward, guided by the Vision till they reach their goal. It is a rich string of jewels, with a faith that never dies in man as the architect of a new world. It only needs the Christmas hope and the Christmas message to turn it into a living reality.

The Problem of Federation. A Study in the History of Political Theory. By Sobei Mogi. (Allen & Unwin. Two volumes. 86s.)

In a short preface, Professor Laski suggests that a special interest attaches to this work in affording us a revelation of the 'impact of peculiarly Western conceptions' upon one who is 'learned in the ways of Oriental civilization.' Apart from such an attraction, however

—and one follows with interest the very definite expressions of the author's personal opinions, scattered throughout the pages—the study has a special value for the amount of important material which the writer has brought together. Much painstaking research has been given to the compilation, and in a valuable bibliography at the end the author gives us a fairly extensive catalogue of the literature on the subject, a considerable amount of which he had previously summarized in the course of his discussion. Federalism has a very modern sound, and it is usual to trace its beginning back to the days of the American War of Independence, but the origin of the conception is really to be found in that birth-place of many of the world's greatest ideas—the Greek city-state. It is suggested by his sub-title that the writer is more concerned with the theory than with the practical expressions of federalism. We confess this brings a feeling of disappointment as we follow his working-out of the history of the conception. An exaggerated sense of the importance of theory is left in the mind of the reader. By far the greater part of the volumes is devoted to German thought; and while we do not wish to minimize the importance of this contribution, and, moreover, are conscious of the comparative poverty of English writing on the subject, yet there is surely a lack of proportion in the arrangement. A discussion of the Greek contribution covers two pages, that of the British and American 120 and 165 pages respectively; the German writers claim 708 pages. It may be admitted that German federalism owes more to its theories than either the British or American. But, while the American Constitution was the gift of a political crisis, rather than the result of the lucubrations of arm-chair professors, it is equally true to state that modern federalism as a whole was the outcome, not of speculation, but of immediate pressing needs. The author, moreover, appears to admit that the world of action has a place, as well as that of thought, by including the references to certain Continental movements, such as the history of the German Labour and Socialist party. The value of his book would have been enhanced could he have appraised the importance and influence of movements in our own country which have contributed in some measure to the development of the federal idea. But, despite these defects, we have in the present volumes a helpful study which will be welcomed by all interested in political science.

Aissa Saved. By Joyce Cary. (Benn. 7s. 6d.)

The author knows Nigeria, and this novel is a startling picture of the cruelty, ignorance, and superstition amid which Mr. and Mrs. Carr are carrying on their mission. Aissa is a native convert who comes to be regarded as a witch and dies a terrible death on an ant-hill. The wild hatred of Christians and pagans gives rise to many scenes that make one shudder and feel thankful when the lurid tale comes to its fearful end. The descriptive power of the writer is undeniable, and the task of building up a new Society amid such storms of passion calls for powers that are much more than human.

Periodical Literature

BRITISH

Hibbert Journal (January).—Dr. Jacks follows an essay by William James on 'The Moral Equivalent for War.' He regards 'disciplined courage' as a prime necessity for a nation in the time of peril and difficulty. James advocated a conscription of the whole youthful population for the war against Nature, which would make them share the hard work of the world and knock the foolishness out of 'gilded youth.' Mr. Montefiore's criticism of Dr. Eisler's views on 'The Beginning of Christianity' turns largely on our Lord's Messianic claims. Professor Jenks's 'History and the Historical Novel' is specially interesting. Sir Oliver Lodge, in 'Religion and the New Knowledge,' says: 'Our Master undoubtedly pre-existed as the Eternal Christ, and is as living and active to-day as ever He was.' Appreciative notices of the Hartley and Fernley Lectures are included in a valuable number.

Expository Times (January).—Dr. Niven writes on 'The Contribution of Great Britain to Church History.' It is a most instructive survey of the work done on various periods, such as the Middle Ages, the Reformation and after, the Eastern Church. Dr. Hulme's *Voices of the New Room* is described as 'a series of delightful and inspiring pictures of some of those who, being set on fire by the Wealeys, became themselves glowing centres of spiritual life and power.' Mrs. Guy Rogers's comprehensive article on 'The Ministry of Women: Past, Present, and Future' should be carefully studied.

Holborn Review (January).—Mr. H. P. Palmer's 'A Papal Legate,' an account of Otho, who was sent to England in 1225, forms a striking illustration of the ecclesiastical conditions of the century. Mr. E. Lucas writes on Sören Kierkegaard, whose teaching has had a powerful influence on that of Karl Barth. Mr. Ernest Richards describes 'The Influence of Methodism on Life and Thought.' The employment of lay preachers, the death-blow struck to deism, the ethical changes wrought, and the burst of sacred song are well described. Other articles are 'On Ghosts and the Unknown,' 'Jane Austen,' and 'Church Orders in the New Testament.'

Church Quarterly (January).—The Archdeacon of Worcester bases the claims of 'Sunday Observance' on its social and spiritual values in this century. 'Massilius and the Papacy' shows that his *Defensor Pacis* was the most radical attack on the Papacy and even on the prevailing conception of kingly power itself. When he wrote it in 1324 he was a doctor in Paris. Dr. Geraldine Hodgson writes on 'Shakespeare's Fools.' Dr. Headlam's third article on theology deals with 'The Church,' its authority, its councils, and its creeds.

Congregational Quarterly (January).—The note about books on sex is important, and the editor's review of *Wesley's Letters* is discriminating and brings out many features of interest. Archbishop Temple, in 'The Idea of Immortality,' concludes that 'man is not immortal by nature or of right; but, if he gives himself to God, the Creator, Redeemer, Sanctifier, he receives from Him both worthiness for life eternal, and, with worthiness, eternal life.' 'The Person of Christ,' by Dr. Franks, with notes by Dr. Robert Mackintosh, is a valuable study of the subject.

Science Progress (January).—The articles in this number make a special appeal to scientists. A wider circle will find much of interest in 'Insects Attacking Stored Products,' which describes the insects and the damage they do, and discusses various methods of dealing with the problem. The review of Dr. Fraser-Harris's *Fraudulent Mediums* shows how much fraud has been mixed up in these matters. The whole number is alive.

John Rylands Bulletin (January).—Dr. E. A. Gardner delivered the first Herford Memorial Lecture in the University of Manchester. He expressed his conviction that the Fascist revolution had opened up a new era of peace and progress in Italy and, he hoped, for all Europe. The *Bulletin* gives the first part of Bishop Theodore of Mopsuestia's *The Book of Faith*, which Dr. Mingana discovered when searching for Syriac MSS. It is a commentary on the Nicene Creed, and deals in much detail with the Trinity and the Incarnation. Some unpublished letters of Dr. Johnson are a valuable part of this important issue.

AMERICAN

Harvard Theological Review.—To the October number, Dr. Shalom Spiegel, of the Jewish Institute of Religion, New York, contributes a learned article (77 pages) on 'Ezekiel or Pseudo-Ezekiel?' After a summary of the critical interpretations of the book, Dr. Spiegel subjects to a searching examination the new analysis of it given by Professor Charles C. Torrey in *Pseudo-Ezekiel and the Original Prophecy*. His conclusions are not accepted; the independent historical value of Ezekiel for the knowledge of pre-exilic or exilic Israel is re-affirmed. Rabbinical literature is freely quoted, especial stress being laid upon the testimony of Hananiah ben Hezekiah. The difficulties with which Ezekiel bristles are frankly recognized; nevertheless, it was included in the canon. 'Had but the slightest doubt been known as to the genuineness of the book, the indulgent attitude of the rabbis would be inexplicable.'

Journal of Religion (January).—Karl Bornhausen in 'Christianity and Idealism' brings out the idealism of Plato, of Jesus and of Paul in a suggestive way. Another important subject is 'The Growth of the Hebrew Idea of God.' 'In a universe so vast and so

methodically constructed there must be a directing and controlling intelligence,' but 'the future only will reveal to man what the divine Intelligence really is.' Dr. H. G. Duncan sums up 111 replies from ex-ministers as to why men enter and leave the ministry.

Colgate-Rochester Bulletin (November).—This is published five times a year by the Baptist Education Society at Rochester, N.Y., in connexion with the Divinity School. An interesting account is given of the Baptist Historical Collection founded by Samuel Colgate nearly fifty years ago. The books now approach 18,000, the pamphlets several tens of thousands. Professor Moehlman's 'American Baptists and Education' gives a general survey of ministerial training and of the college at Hamilton, which received its first student in 1818. This has grown into the Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, to which Mr. Rockefeller made a 'five-to-one' gift. (January).—An account is given of the buildings, the staff, and the studies of the college, with full-page illustrations.

CANADIAN

Canadian Journal of Religious Thought (November—December).—Mr. Wilson Knight, now Professor of English Literature at Trinity College, Toronto, in 'Naturalism and Orthodoxy,' selects for notice Mr. Middleton Murry's book on *God*. The ultimate reality to him is not God, but the evolutionary process. His is a philosophical, scientific scheme which awakes no instinctive romance. The Rev. A. E. Belden unfolds 'The Ideals of Christian Socialism.' He holds that the way for the return of the working masses is to make worship for them 'the practice of a new sociality of spirit in adoration of a God of Universal Love, and to act as a stimulus to the organization of the Social Order.'

FOREIGN

Moslem World (January).—Raymond Lull's *Mission and Message* are given, with a note by Eugene Stock, who described him as 'the first and, perhaps, the greatest missionary to the Mohammedans.' His statue at Palma appears as frontispiece. The Bishop of Persia writes on 'Evangelism through Schools in the Near East,' and F. H. Foster on 'Mohammed's Evangel.' He delivered his people from great superstitions, but his appeal to fear was terrific.

Calcutta Review (November—December).—This full number has articles on Dante, India, and the Gold Standard, and an important estimate of Háfiz, with many extracts from his poems. Notes on 'The Personal Relations of Warren Hastings and Sir Thomas Rumbold,' and an account of Dr. Mary Scharlieb, are of special interest. (January) 'The Inland Fishers of Bengal' and 'Rural Reconstruction in India' are important.